


354068

JPRS 82024

20 October 1982

19980922 110



USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1322

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET
FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

2
102
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

20 October 1982

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1322

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

CONTENTS

Contents of 'NARODY AZII I AFRIKI' (NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, No 1, 1982).....	1
English Summaries of Major Articles in 'NARODY AZII I AFRIKI' (NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, No 1, 1982).....	4
Contents of May-June 1982 Issue (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82).....	8
Information on Authors (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82).....	10
Ideological Significance of Terminological Disputes in CCP (Aleksandr Vadimovich Pantsov; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82).....	12
Makeup, Goals of W. European Antiwar Movement Surveyed (Ovanes Nagapetovich Melikyan; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82).....	20
Points of Contact, Disagreement With Latin American Social Democrats (E. S. Dabagyan; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82)..<	31
Symposium Held on Social Democrats (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82).....	49
Book on International Unity of Communist Parties Reviewed (I. M. Krivoguz; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, May-Jun 82)..<	56

Differing Means of Colonial Domination by Imperialist States (Gleriy Kuz'mich Shirokov; NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, May-Jun 82).....	62
Governmental Forms of Socialist-Orientation African States (Yevgeniy Nikolayevich Mel'nikov; NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, May-Jun 82).....	75
Libyan Domestic, Foreign Policies Under Qadhafi Evaluated (L. B. Borisov; NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, May-Jun 82).....	87

CONTENTS OF 'NARODY AZII I AFRIKI'

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 1, 1982 pp 1-2, 221-222

CONTENTS

Articles

A. Ya. El'yanov. "The Developing Countries: Foreign Economic Relations and the Reproduction Process."	3
A. M. Mel'nikov. "'The Farmers' Movement' in the Indian Village"	15
V. A. Tyurin. "The Social and Political Structure of the Medieval Societies of Southeast Asia"	25
V. B. Iordanskiy. "Tropical Africa: Ideas About Age and Death"	35
A. I. Kobzev. "On the Categories of Traditional Chinese Philosophy"	47

Opinion Exchange

Class Formation and the Choice of a Path of Development

O. Z. Mushtuk. "On the Question of the 'Privileged Nature' of the African Proletariat"	59
--	----

From the History of Oriental Studies and Africanistics

B. A. Litvinskiy. "A Study of the Ancient History and Culture of Eastern Turkestan in Domestic and Foreign Scholarship"	69
---	----

Communications

A. N. Kamenskiy. "The Migration of Labor Power to the Arab East"	79
G. G. Kosach and G. A. Prozorova. "The Establishment of the Communist Movement in Iraq (End of the 1920s and Beginning of the 1930s)"	89
D. V. Mosyakov. "Khmer Petty Bourgeois Utopias and the Practice of the Pol Pot Regime"	98
I. L. Fadeyeva. "The Conception of Culture and Civilization of the Turkish Philosopher Zii Gek Alpa"	106

Publications

- "The Code of Laws of the Great Ming Dynasty With Commentaries and Additional Decrees. Ceremonial Laws." Introduction, Translation, and Commentaries by N. P. Svistunova 115

Scholarly Life

- O. K. Dreyer. "The Chief Editorial Board of Eastern Literature in 1982" 128
Yu. N. Vinokurov. "Tradition and the Present in Africa" 132

Chronicles

- Dissertation Defenses (First Half of 1981) 139

Criticism and Bibliography

Discussion

- V. I. Pavlov. "Toward a Stage and Formation Characterization of Modern Eastern Societies." Participants: L. B. Alayev, N. S. Meyer, L. I. Reysner, Ye. M. Metvetev, K. Z. Ashrafyan, A. N. Petrov, N. S. Illarionov (Kishinev). Reply: V. I. Pavlov 149

Reviews

- L. Ye. Kubbel'. "Ancient and Medieval Africa in the 'Cambridge History of Africa'" 173

Brief Reviews

- V. G. Burov, O. Ye. Vladimirov, M. A. Il'in, "The Evolution of the Politics and Ideology of Maoism in the 1970s and Early 1980s" 179
F. A. Trinich. M. M. Gurevich. "Afghanistan's Foreign Trade During the Modern Period" 184
M. S. Lazarev. Yu. V. Bromley. "Contemporary Problems of Ethnography. Essays in Theory and History" 187
M. N. Todorova. N. A. Dulina. "The Ottoman Empire and International Relations (The 1830s and 1840s)" 193
Ye. A. Frolova. A. V. Sagateyev. "Ibn'sina (Avitsenna)" 197
B. L. Rifmin, "Baujuan o Pu-ming. Facsimile. Publication of the Text Translation From Chinese, Research, and Commentaries by E. S. Stulova" 200
S. V. Kullanda. F. H. Van Naerssen, R. C. De Jongh. "The Economic and Administrative History of Early Indonesia" 206

Book Notes

I. V. Mozheyko. A. G. Gavrilova. "The National Question in Burma in the 1940s and 1950s. Some Problems of the Struggle for a Single State"	211
Yu. L. Vasil'yev. Ye. V. Peryshkin. "The Political System of the Republic of Zambia"	213
G. G. Sviridov and V. I. Sisauri (both from Leningrad). "Periodical Publications of the Asian and African Countries in the Social Sciences." Summary Catalogue of Leningrad's Library Funds in Three Books. Book II. The Far East. Part 2. Japan	215
M. B. Piotrovskiy (Leningrad). "History of Eastern Studies, Arabistics, and Kurdology in the Asian Museum and Leningrad Division of the Institute of Eastern Studies. 1818-1868 (in Arabic)"	217
V. N. Kislyakov (Leningrad). "Collections of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the Formation of the First Academy Ethnography Center"	218
Information on Our Writers	220
Summary of the Basic Articles in the English Language	221

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki"
GLAVNAYA REDAKTSIYA VOSTOCHNOY LITERATURY, 1982

2959
CSO: 1807/108

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN 'NARODY AZII I AFRIKI'

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKA in Russian No 1, 1982 pp 221-222

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: EXTERNAL
ECONOMIC TIES
IN THE PROCESS OF REPRODUCTION

A. YA. ELYANOV

The article gives prominence to the foreign trade, which is an indicator of the disproportions, existing between and within industries and the related problem of establishing a modern kind of production in developing countries. Owing to the general socio-economic backwardness, poor industrial base, limited labour resources as well as small scale and fragmented nature of the domestic market, the import needs of these states grow, as a rule, more rapidly than the overall production. Under these circumstances, the lack of imported goods impedes the accumulation of capital, leads to the underutilization of industrial capacities, gives stimuli to inflationary trends. This raises the problem of hard currency reserves, the main source of which is export, which characterizes the degree and nature of the nation's participation in the international division of labour.

Although over the past two decades the position of the social product in developing countries, realized at the external market, showed an upward trend, the majority of them suffered from the shortage of hard currency.

The number of states short of foreign exchange and the scale of this shortage were growing. The poor material and technical base and the backward commodity structure of export as well as unfavourable correlation of export and import prices account for this. All this is largely due to the unequal position of the developing countries in the world capitalist economy. In order to cover the shortage of hard currency reserves the liberated states have to resort to external loans and credits on unfavourable terms. The payment of these loans and credits is a heavy burden and limits the scope of their economic progress.

The radical solution to the foreign trade problems of the developing states is associated with the restructuring of the system of international relations, inherited from the colonial past, on a just and equal basis. The relaxation of international tension and expansion and enhancement of the political and economic cooperation between the developing nations and the USSR is a sine qua non of such a restructuring.

"FARMER MOVEMENTS" IN THE INDIAN VILLAGE

A. M. MELNIKOV

The mounting economic struggle waged by the Indian agricultural producer in the 1970s is accountable for by the world economic crisis. This crisis had affected Indian relations with developing nations. Due to this, the rising price differentials forced India to increase its export of raw material by 50 percent to cover its industrial import. This burden was placed by Indian industrialists upon the agricultural producer: on the one hand, the prices of the industrial goods used in agriculture soared, on the other, those of agricultural products rose insignificantly.

The price policy of the government was confined to equalizing the season fluctuations, yielding to the demands of the agricultural producer. The green revolution, which followed shortly, required a large-scale investment and necessitated a review of the price policy both in regard of the industrial goods used in agriculture and agricultural products.

The agricultural producers started to demand higher buying prices. This demand was supported by the democratic forces, including the Communist Party. On the initiative of the latter the Association of Agricultural Producers (cultivating cotton, sugar-cane, rice, etc.) was formed. The government had to meet some of the demands.

The movement was especially active in the end of 1980. It started in Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and Tamilnadu. Independent farmer organizations started coming up as rasta roko (stop the traffic movement) erupted and clashes with the police followed. Almost all political parties joined the movement. The participation of the left democratic forces lent it a greater scale. The government had to give in and to raise the buying prices. The mass movement subsided but the problem is still there.

SOCIO-POLITICAL STRUCTURE OF THE MEDIEVAL SOCIETIES OF SOUTH EAST ASIA

V. A. TYURIN

The article singles out three major subregional types of the socio-political structure of the dominating class: the Vietnamese (feudal bureaucratic), the Malayan, or coastal (military-feudal) and the Indo-Chinese and Malayan (state-patriarchal).

The administrative relations determined the social relationship under the feudal-bureaucratic system. The dominating class constituted a single whole, being an all embracing organization with predominating administrative functions.

The coastal South East Asian societies of the Malayan and Indonesian world were another pole of this structure. The relations within the dominating class were those of military subordination. The military-feudal type of the dominating class tended towards isolation, was less open, with the hereditary status playing a more prominent role. This type was characterised by a relatively independent ideology.

The state-patriarchal type was close to the feudal-bureaucratic model. The administrative function was also its system-building element. At the same time, the clan relations played an important role, for the local feudals enjoyed a relative independence. The socio-political organization of the societies of this model was determined by the relations between the centre, embodying the trends of the centralised bureaucratic development, and the fairly stable units headed by landholding families, which were integrated into the administrative system. The structure and forms of the particular manifestation of social relations were based on the patriarchal domination.

TROPICAL AFRICA: THE CIRCLE
OF IDEAS OF
OLD AGE AND DEATH

V. B. IORDANSKY

Stability of the elders' authority in the village of the present-day Tropical Africa induced the author to examine what kind of notions in the African people's cultures are associated with age. The author, inter alia, analyses the way the passing years modified the individual's inner structure, its relationship with the mythological world and the society, as a whole.

ON THE CATEGORIES OF THE TRADITIONAL
CHINESE PHILOSOPHY

A. I. KOBSEV

In the course of age-old independent and uninterrupted development the philosophical thought of the traditional China has evolved most specific means of self-expression, notably, an original system of categories. Today, this system continues to play the role of a paradigm for the philosophical language, exerting thus a certain influence of the modern Chinese philosophical and socio-political conceptions. In the strict sense of the word, this system of categories constitutes a very limited range of terms, which quantitatively is comparable with the classification scheme universal in the traditional China, the 64 member set of the Ji King hexagrams. The specific feature of these terms lies in the fact that, owing to their symbolic nature, they allow for texts which can be interpreted both in terms of metaphors on the one hand, and rational approach. To ignore this, would lead to a one-sided and controversial evaluation of the Chinese philosophy as exceedingly speculative and abstract, or too imaginative and practical.

These generalizations are proved by the analysis of the fundamental category of wu hsing, or five elements. This analysis demonstrates that the wu hsing is a peculiar methodological symbol of a general nature, or a classification scheme for a whole range of basic and qualitatively varying aspects of being, and does not merely denote its primary substances.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki"

GLAVNAYA REDAKTSIYA VOSTOCHNOY LITERATURY, 1982

2959

CSO: 1807/108

CONTENTS OF MAY-JUNE 1982 ISSUE

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 p 2

[Text] Contents

"A Constructive Policy".....	3
Commemorating the 60th Anniversary of the USSR	
"Excerpts from the History of V. I. Lenin's Development of the Marxist Theory of Nationality"--M. O'Riordan.....	10
"The USSR's Cooperation with the CEMA Countries on the Basis of the Principles of Socialist Internationalism"--N. I. Ivanov.....	15
Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of G. Dimitrov's Birth	
"G. Dimitrov on the Leading Role of the Working Class and the Communist Party"--K. Baychinskiy.....	22
"Questions Connected with the Reinforcement of the Communist Parties and the Activities of G. Dimitrov"--F. I. Firsov.....	31
China: Facts and Problems	
"Notes on the CCP Debate Over the 'Thought of Mao Zedong'"--A. V. Pantsov..	44
The Status and Struggle of Labor in the Developed Capitalist Countries	
"France: Changes in the Mass Consciousness and the Victory of Leftist Forces"--I. M. Bunin.....	48
"The Antiwar Positions of Labor Unions in the Developed Capitalist Countries at the Present Time (Survey)".....	59
"The Laboring Public of the Capitalist Countries in 1981: The Status and Structure of Labor Unions and Their Demands (Scientific Analytical Survey)".....	76
"Western Europe in the 1980's: The Antiwar Resistance Movement"--O. N. Melikyan.....	89
"Italian Problems"--S. I. Vasil'tsov, A. A. Gal'kin and T. T. Timofeyev....	98

African Proletariat

"Progressive Labor Unions in South Africa in the Struggle for Peace"-- I. A. Ulanovskaya.....	108
--	-----

Trade Unions in Today's World

"The 10th World Trade Union Congress on the Objectives of the Laboring Public's Struggle in the 1980's"--A. V. Shumeyko.....	114
"The Labor Unions of the FRG in the Struggle for Worker Participation in Production Management"--V. I. Maslov.....	120
"The Problem of Concerted Action by Labor in the Metalworking Industry"-- V. V. Kleyeberg.....	126

The Social Democrats Today

"Ideological and Political Concepts of Latin American Social Democrats"-- E. S. Dabagyan.....	132
--	-----

Reports

"Some Aspects of the Socioeconomic Status of Finnish Labor"-- M. L. Babashkina.....	148
"The United States: The Defeat of the Air Traffic Controllers Union"-- S. A. Yershov.....	153

Scientific Life

"A Discussion of the Problems of Social Democrats"--V. Sh.....	157
--	-----

Criticism and Bibliography

"The Source of New Labor Strength"--A. Ya. Utenkov.....	161
"The International Unity of Communists"--I. M. Krivoguz.....	163
"Fundamental Study of the Social Structure in Present-Day Bulgaria"-- T. A. Babushkina.....	166
"Postwar History of the JCP"--L. P. Arskaya.....	170
"The Capitalist Road in Light of Problems in Industrialization"-- A. G. Smirnov.....	173
"The Sociology of the Working Class of Great Britain"--V. Valentinov.....	175
"Problems in the Ideological Evolution of the SPD"--V. Ya. Shveytser.....	179
"Monograph on the Intelligentsia of the Orient"--V. G. Korgun.....	182

Brief Book Reviews.....	185
-------------------------	-----

Information on Authors.....	190
-----------------------------	-----

English Table of Contents.....	191
--------------------------------	-----

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

INFORMATION ON AUTHORS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYIY MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 p 191

[Text] O'Riordan, Michael--secretary general of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ireland

Ivanov, Nikolay Ivanovich--doctor of economic sciences and professor

Baychinskiy, Kostadin--deputy director of the Institute of Party History, Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party

Firsov, Fridrikh Igorevich--doctor of historical sciences and senior scientific associate at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CPSU Central Committee

Pantsov, Aleksandr Vadimovich--scientific associate at the IMRD [Institute of the International Workers Movement], USSR Academy of Sciences

Bunin, Igor' Mikhaylovich--candidate of historical sciences and scientific associate at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences

Melikyan, Ovanes Nagapetovich--candidate of historical sciences and deputy director of the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Vasil'tsov, Sergey Ivanovich--candidate of historical sciences and senior associate at the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Galkin, Aleksandr Abramovich--doctor of historical sciences and department head at the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Timofeyev, Timur Timofeyevich--corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Ulanovskaya, Irina Arkad'yevna--candidate of historical sciences and senior scientific associate at the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Shumeyko, Anna Vasil'yevna--scientific associate at the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Maslov, Vladimir Ivanovich--candidate of economic sciences and senior scientific associate at the IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences

Kleyeberg, Vladimir Vyacheslavovich--candidate of historical sciences and head of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union

Dabagyan, Emil' Surenovich--doctor of historical sciences and senior scientific associate at the Institute of Latin America, USSR Academy of Sciences

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

IDEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TERMINOLOGICAL DISPUTES IN CCP

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 44-47

[Article by Aleksandr Vadimovich Pantsov, scientific associate at the Institute of the International Workers Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences: "Notes on the CCP Debate Over the 'Thought of Mao Zedong'"]

[Text] The need to reassess the lessons of the Chinese revolution has been debated in China since the end of 1978 on various levels--from private meetings of the top party leadership to public notices in the press. "The Decision on Some Questions of Party History Since the Time of the PRC's Founding," which was adopted in June 1981 at the 6th Plenum of the 11th CCP Central Committee and recorded a number of official judgments on various events and developments, did not put an end to the debate, although it did relieve some tension.

The party's ideological heritage lies at the center of the debate. Questions are being raised about the legality of Maoism, about Mao Zedong's right to call himself the author of this doctrine and about fundamental aspects of the philosophical, economic and sociological premises of Maoist theory. The terminological accuracy of the CCP ideology's name is also being questioned. As we know, the term "Maoism" ("maozhuyi") is not used in China; Mao Zedong's precepts are called "Mao Zedong sixiang," which is usually translated as the "thought of Mao Zedong" in Soviet literature. The question of how and why this name came into being has been discussed repeatedly in Chinese newspapers and magazines.

The official view is the following: Mao Zedong supposedly believed that his views had "not attained maturity" and were "undergoing a process of development" and he therefore rejected the term "Maozedongism"; on the other hand, Mao allegedly always regarded his ideology as a product of collective party wisdom, as a result of which he could not agree to a term containing the possessive noun suffix "di" or the word "comrade" (for example: "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang"--"the thought of Comrade Mao Zedong"; "Mao Zedongdi luxian"--"the line of Mao Zedong" and so forth).

This reply certainly sounds suspicious. It does not explain why the Chinese political vocabulary still contains the official qualifying term "Mao Zedong sixiang tixi" ("system of the thought of Mao Zedong"). What is the reason for the sudden display of "modesty" and "sense of collectivism" by Mao, who was never distinguished by these virtues? At the same time, it would be hard not to agree with the Chinese leaders who are now saying that Mao Zedong was "extremely circumspect" with regard

to his own beliefs and their terminological designations.¹ It is most probable that there were other, deeper motives for the choice of the term "Mao Zedong sixiang."

The facts testify that the Mao Zedong leadership of the Chinese Communist Party began the search for a special name for their own ideological constructs during the course of the so-called campaign to "Sinize Marxism" in the CCP in the second half of the 1930's and the first half of the 1940's. This campaign led, as is well known, to a situation in which all of the party's historical and ideological development was distorted to suit the cult of personality of Mao Zedong. During the distortion process, anti-Marxist theories and concepts were substituted for real Marxism-Leninism. These significant changes were directly related to a formal change: In the party charter adopted at the Seventh All-China CCP Congress (April-June 1945), the term "Marxism-Leninism" ("makesilieningzhuyi"), used to define the ideological bases of the party, was officially replaced with the term "thought of Mao Zedong" ("Mao Zedong sixiang"). "The Chinese Communist Party," the charter said, "regards the thought uniting the theory of Marxism-Leninism with the practice of the Chinese Revolution--the thought of Mao Zedong--as the guiding star of all its work."²

An analysis of documents and the testimony of witnesses prove that the official term was chosen from a multitude of phrases during the course of numerous discussions closed to the public--from private conversations by members of the Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat to debates at the Seventh Extended Plenum of the Sixth CCP Central Committee (the latter, as was recently reported in China, lasted from 21 May 1944 to 20 April 1945).³ Some of the results of these discussions--in the form of various terminological innovations--were reflected in the party press and in public statements by party leaders. Not one of the terms was officially suggested and the reasons why a specific term should be used were never explained. Certain terms simply began to be used as a matter of course.

One of the first to be coined was the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi lilun" ("the theory of Comrade Mao Zedong") in September 1940.⁴ In July 1941 the political commissar of the 115th Division of the Eighth National Revolutionary Army, Luo Ronghuan, first used the term "Mao Zedong sixiang." He also coined the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang" ("the thought of Comrade Mao Zedong") at the same time.⁵ On 19 February 1942 an article by Zhang Ruxin (Zhang Shuan), who later became a famous analyst of Maoism, entitled "The Theory and Strategy of Mao Zedong Must Be Studied and Mastered" and published in ZEFANG RIBAO, contained three new synonymous terms: "Mao Zedongdi lilun he celiue" ("the theory and strategy of Mao Zedong"), "Mao Zedong tongzhidi lilun he celiue" ("the theory and strategy of Comrade Mao Zedong") and "maozedongzhuyi" ("Maozedongism").⁶

On 1 July 1943, Chen Yi, acting commander of the new Fourth Army, addressed a meeting of Central China cadres, commemorating the 22d anniversary of the CCP, and used the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi zhuzhang" ("the viewpoint of Comrade Mao Zedong").⁷ On 6 July 1943, Liu Shaoqi, member of the CCP Central Committee Secretariat, followed Luo Ronghuan's example and used the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang" in a ZEFANG RIBAO article entitled "Menshevist Ideas Must Be Purged from the Party." In addition, he also used the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang tixi" ("the system of the thought of Comrade Mao Zedong").⁸

A few days after the publication of Liu Shaoqi's article, an article by Wang Jiaxiang, alternate member of the Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the Central Committee Military Council and chief of the Main Political Administration of the Eighth National Revolutionary Army, appeared in ZEFANG RIBAO and again contained the term "Mao Zedong sixiang." In addition to using this term several times in the article, Wang Jiaxiang also used, but only once, the term "Mao Zedong tongzhi sixiang" (in Russian, this is synonymous with the term "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang"--"the thought of Comrade Mao Zedong").⁹

On 2 August 1943, Zhou Enlai, member of the Central Committee Politburo, spoke at a festive meeting celebrating his return from Chongqing to Yanan and used the terms "Mao Zedong tongzhidi yijian" ("views of Comrade Mao Zedong"), "Mao Zedong tongzhidi fangxiang" ("course of Comrade Mao Zedong") and "Mao Zedong tongzhidi luxian" ("line of Comrade Mao Zedong") as synonyms for "Sinized Marxism-Leninism" and "Chinese Communism."¹⁰

In addition to these terms, others were used in 1943-1945: "Mao Zedong tongzhidi daolu" ("path of Comrade Mao Zedong"), "Mao Zedongdi zuofang" ("style of Mao Zedong") and "Mao Zedongdi sixiang" (equivalent in Russian to "Mao Zedong sixiang"--"thought of Mao Zedong"). It is indicative that almost all of these labels continued to bear equal weight in party documents and articles and speeches by party leaders until the Seventh CCP Congress. The final choice of the official term had not taken place at that time. For example, when Kang Sheng, then a member of the Central Committee Politburo, presented a speech on "Emergency Rescue Procedures" at a meeting of CCP Central Committee officials on 15 July 1943, he used the terms "thought of Comrade Mao Zedong" and "theory of Comrade Mao Zedong."¹¹ The terms "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang" and "Mao Zedong sixiang" were both used in the editor's foreword to the "Selected Works of Mao Zedong," published in May 1944 by the publishing house of the JINCHAJI RIBAO newspaper with Deng Tuo as the editor-in-chief.¹²

In September 1944 famous man of letters Xiao San (Emi Xiao) persisted in using the term "maozedongzhuyi" ("Maozedongism") in his work "The Beginning of Comrade Mao Zedong's Revolutionary Activity."¹³ The same term was used as a basic definition in the first draft of the "Decision on Some Questions of History," adopted by the Seventh Extended Plenum of the Sixth Central Committee on 20 April 1945.¹⁴ The third draft of the "Decision" (dated 15 April 1945) did not contain the work "maozedongzhuyi" and used the terms "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang," "Mao Zedong sixiang," "Mao Zedong luxian," "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang yu (and 'he' in another case) zuofeng" ("the thought and style of Comrade Mao Zedong") and "Mao Zedong tongzhidi fangzhen" ("the course of Comrade Mao Zedong") as synonyms for "Chinese Communism."¹⁵ The final draft of the "Decision" used the terms "Mao Zedong tongzhidi lilun" ("theory of Comrade Mao Zedong"), "Mao Zedong tongzhidi sixiang, luxian, zuofeng" ("thought, line and style of Comrade Mao Zedong"), "Mao Zedong tongzhidi fangzhen" and also--seven times--"Mao Zedong sixiang."¹⁶

The adoption of the CCP Charter, which officially recorded the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" as the basic definition of the ideological bases of the Chinese Communist Party, did not put an end to terminological debates in the nationalist party leadership, although it slightly limited their scales. In August 1948, Wu Yuzhang, member of the CCP Central Committee, suggested that the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" be replaced with "maozedongzhuyi" and sent a telegram to Mao Zedong on the matter.¹⁷

Earlier, in 1946, the previously mentioned work by Xiao San was reprinted in the anthology "The Image of Mao Zedong" and it still contained the appeal to use the term "maozedongzhuyi."¹⁸ Soon afterward, a separate brochure was issued without any changes in Xiao San's work.¹⁹ By the beginning of 1949 the tendency to use the term "maozedongzhuyi" was apparently quite strong in the party.

On 13 March 1949, when Mao Zedong presented the concluding speech at the Second Plenum of the Seventh CCP Central Committee, he stated the exact reason why the thought of Chinese Communists ("zhongguo gongchandangrendi sixiang") should not be called an "ism" ("zhuyi"). Unfortunately, the stenographic record of Mao Zedong's speech has not been published yet and we cannot guess at the details. For some time the terms "Mao Zedongdi sixiang" and "Mao Zedongdi sixiang ji zuofeng" ("the thought and style of Mao Zedong") coexisted with the term "maozedongzhuyi" and the phrase "Mao Zedong sixiang" at the end of the 1940's.²⁰

In the 1950's and 1960's the debates over the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" continued. In 1955, for example, the substitution of the term "maozedongzhuyi" for "Mao Zedong sixiang" was suggested once again by several delegates at the All-China Conference of Workers Engaged in Mental Labor.²¹ At an all-army conference of cadres in fall 1959, Lin Biao, then the PRC defense minister, called contemporary Marxism-Leninism "Mao zhuxidi sixiang" ("the thought of Chairman Mao").²² In May 1966, at an extended session of the CCP Central Committee Politburo, Kang Sheng returned to the topic of the substitution of "maozedongzhuyi" for "Mao Zedong sixiang." "The Thought of Mao Zedong," he said, "should be called Maozedongism for the sake of accuracy."²³ During the "Cultural Revolution" attempts were made to legalize the term "maozedongzhuyi" in Red Guard leaflets and appeals.²⁴

Why did the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" gain such a strong foothold in the political vocabulary of the Chinese Communists as the official term designating their guiding ideology?²⁵

We believe that the main reason was that the term "maozedongzhuyi" had already been used in an extremely negative sense in the Chinese Communist Party. It was coined by CCP Central Committee workers at the time of the "fall harvest" uprising in August-September 1927 as a synonym for military opportunism.²⁶ Besides this, "maozedongzhuyi" had been used several times as a negative term by Ye Qing, famous theorist of Chinese Trotskyism, in his work "The War of Resistance and Culture."²⁷ Ye Qing asserted that there was not a single grain of Marxism-Leninism in Mao Zedong; there was only an "ism"--"Maozedongism"--"representing the 'ism' of the peasant petty bourgeoisie."²⁸ Ye Qing's work was well known to Chinese Communists and Mao Zedong had to take this into consideration.

In the second place, Mao had to consider the international position of the CCP and its urgent need for material, especially military and political, assistance from the USSR and the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Under these conditions, neither he nor any of his closest supporters could dare to, as Wang Ming put it, "stoke a separate stove"--or, in other words, propose a new "ism" which the international communist movement would interpret as something in direct contrast to Marxism-Leninism. It is significant that when Mao Zedong discussed the possibility of officially declaring "maozedongzhuyi" with some CCP leaders in the second half of 1941, he did contrast this term, as something which supposedly stood for

"Chinese Marxism," to Leninism, which stood for, as he put it, purely "Russian" Marxism.²⁹

It is also indicative that 13 years later, in 1954, when relations with the USSR were being developed, Mao proposed that the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" not be used at all, saying that this would "prevent the spread of false rumors."³⁰ The exact nature of the rumors can be guessed from a special notice issued by the CCP Central Committee Propaganda Department in reference to Mao's statement. It said: "Its (the thought of Mao Zedong--A. P.) content and the content of Marxism-Leninism are identical.... When the party charter and major party documents adopted earlier are being explained, the original text should still be used, with no changes. Special mention should be made of the fact that 'the "Thought of Mao Zedong" is the thought of Marxism-Leninism,' however, in order to avoid the possibility of false rumors about differences in the meanings of the two terms."³¹

In the third place, the choice of the term was certainly dictated by Mao's desire, which had already been quite clearly displayed in 1940, to establish a unique, purely Chinese ideology which would reflect the interests of all strata of Chinese society equally--from the proletariat to some of the landowners and the national bourgeoisie--some kind of united front ideology.³² The term "sixiang," unlike "zhuyi," was the best possible designation for this kind of supraclass common Chinese ideology. In contrast to "zhuyi," this term was of Chinese origin. During the modern era it had been borrowed by the Japanese from the ancient Chinese language, in which it meant "comprehending," "thinking" and "remembering." The Japanese borrowed it as a designation for the new Western concepts of "ideology" and "ideas." Therefore, "sixiang" returned to China from Japan enriched with new meaning.

As for "zhuyi," it is not rooted in Chinese tradition. The Japanese invented their own compound word, made up of the Chinese characters "zhu" ("basis") and "yi" ("meaning"), to signify the Western concepts "doctrine," "principle" and "cause." The term "zhuyi" then made its way to China from Japan as something unknown to the Chinese.³³ Naturally, "sixiang" was more understandable and more familiar to the Chinese masses, who were strongly influenced by the past even during the modern era, than the foreign "zhuyi."

As Polish researcher T. Sparag has pointed out, even the most sacred views evoked negative reactions and resistance in traditional China when they were disseminated and explained with the aid of new or unfamiliar terminology. Innovative concepts and doctrines, on the other hand, won the recognition and support of the masses if they were backed up by the traditional vocabulary. This is why, Sparag stresses, the inventors of new political and ideological concepts and theories in China always made a perceptible effort to use as much old terminology as possible.³⁴

This was also true of Mao Zedong, who was relatively well versed in the political culture of China. It was no coincidence that he generally "flavored" his fundamental works with numerous quotations from the ancient classics that are so highly respected and valued by the Chinese people.

In the fourth place, the choice of the specific term was obviously also connected with the fact that, in comparison to all other terms, with the exception of the

previously discussed "maozedongzhuyi," the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" is much more effective at denoting an integral, systematized ideology. The absence of the possessive suffix "di" between "Mao Zedong" and "sixiang" provides an opportunity to interpret the phrase not only as the "thought" (which might be rather uncoordinated) "of Mao Zedong," but also as a definite ideological system--"Maozedongthought." It is noteworthy that this is how this term has been translated into Russian for the last 13 years in China.³⁵ In this connection, statements by today's Chinese leaders who are trying to prove the collective authorship of "Mao Zedong sixiang" are equally indicative.

When Italian correspondent O. Fallaci interviewed Deng Xiaoping in August 1980, he made it clear that the choice of the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" in the 1940's was due to this term's connotation of a comprehensive ideology.³⁶

Therefore, we could conclude that the choice of the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" as the official name of the guiding ideology of the Chinese Communist Party was natural. This term expressed, in the most concentrated and yet camouflaged form, the pretensions of the nationalist CCP leaders regarding the establishment of their own integral ideology.

FOOTNOTES

1. RENMIN RIBAO, 25 December 1979.
2. "CCP. Charter. Li Shaoqi. Report on Changes in the Charter" (in Chinese), 1949, p 3.
3. HONGQI, 1981, No 12, p 32.
4. ZHONGGUO QINGNIAN, 1940, vol 2, No 9, pp 2, 5.
5. HONGQI, 1981, No 16, p 12.
6. JIEFANG RIBAO, 19 February 1942.
7. Ibid., 7 July 1943.
8. Ibid., 6 July 1943.
9. Ibid., 8 July 1943.
10. Zhou Enlai, "Selected Works" (in Chinese), Beijing, 1980, p 138.
11. See K'ung Te-liang, "First Appearance of 'Mao Zedong's Thought,'" ISSUES AND STUDIES, 1973, vol IX, No 5, p 40.
12. HONGQI, 1981, No 8, p 49.
13. QUNZHONG, 1944, vol 9, No 15-16.

14. Wang Ming, "Half a Century of the CCP and the Treachery of Mao Zedong," Moscow, 1975, p 164.
15. "Decision on Some Questions of History. Third Draft" (in Chinese), 1945, pp 1, 3, 26, 32, 33.
16. "Decision on Some Questions of History" (in Chinese), 1945, pp 1, 2, 36, 43, 44, 45.
17. RENMIN RIBAO, 25 December 1979.
18. Chen Yucang, "The Dissection of the Thought of Mao Zedong" (in Chinese), vol I, Taipei, 1974, p 3.
19. Xiao San, "The Beginning of Comrade Mao Zedong's Revolutionary Activity" (in Chinese), Dalian.
20. Zhang Ruxin, "The Thought and Style of Mao Zedong" (in Chinese), Harbin, 1946.
21. HONGQI, 1981, No 2, p 33.
22. Ibid.
23. Quoted in: HONGQI, 1981, No 2, p 34.
24. See "Maoizm--ideynyy i politicheskiy protivnik marksizma-leninizma" [Maoism--the Ideological and Political Opponent of Marxism-Leninism], Moscow, 1975, p 5.
25. In an attempt to underscore the "continuity" of Maoism and Marxism-Leninism, the CCP leaders have invariably included the term "Mao Zedong sixiang" in the phrase "makesilieningzhuyi--Mao Zedong sixiang" (Marxism-Leninism-Thought of Mao Zedong) in definitions of the ideological bases of the CCP since April 1969 (the time of the ninth party congress).
26. See A. S. Titov, "Mao Zedong's 'Leftist'-Opportunist Position During the Period of the 'Fall Harvest' Uprising in China (1927)" in: "Antimarksistskaya sushchnost' vzglyadov i politiki Mao Tszeduna" [The Anti-Marxist Essence of Mao Zedong's Views and Policies], Moscow, 1969, p 301.
27. Ye Qing is also known as Raphael, but his real name is Ren Zhuoxuan. In the early 1920's he studied and worked in France, and this is where he joined the Chinese communist movement. In 1925-1926, when he was studying first at the Communist University of the Workers of the East and then at the Sun Yat-sen University of Chinese Workers, he performed the duties of secretary of the Moscow division (raykom) of the CCP. In 1927 he left the party and took a counterrevolutionary stand.
28. Quoted in: HONGQI, 1981, No 14, p 8.
29. Wang Ming, Op. cit., pp 15-17.

30. HONGQI, 1981, No 2, p 34.
31. Ibid.
32. Mao Zedong, "On the New Democratism" (in Chinese), 1940.
33. Gao Mingkai and Liu Zhentan, "An Analysis of the Foreign Words in the Contemporary Chinese Language" (in Chinese), Beijing, 1958, pp 88, 96.
34. See "Kritika ideologii i praktiki maoizma" [Criticism of the Ideology and Practice of Maoism], Collected Essays, pt 1, Moscow, 1979, pp 185-188.
35. The term "Maozedongthought" was first used in Russian-language publications in China on 15 April 1969, when the Ninth CCP Congress was hard at work.
36. Quoted in: HONGQI, 1981, No 2, p 36.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

MAKEUP, GOALS OF W. EUROPEAN ANTIWAR MOVEMENT SURVEYED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 89-97

[Article by Ovanes Nagapetovich Melikyan, candidate of historical sciences and deputy director of the Institute of the International Workers Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences: "Western Europe in the 1980's: The Antiwar Resistance Movement"]

[Text] Two major opposing tendencies--international tension and detente--are more apparent now than ever before. The supporters of the former are making a massive effort to push mankind into a cold war and are balancing precariously on the brink of a "hot" war; the supporters of the latter have chosen to actively oppose this.

The struggle between these tendencies is growing quite intense in Europe, which is dangerously saturated with nuclear and other weapons. The growing initiative of the masses in the antiwar movement is developing here with remarkable intensity. The masses are exerting increasing pressure on the ruling circles responsible for the preservation of peace and security in Europe.

Although the antiwar movement has been developing without any prolonged pauses or interruptions, the actual essence, scales and impact of the movement become particularly clear when crises break out in the world arena, at times of abrupt political reversals, when, as L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, a single faulty step could be fatal. This is precisely why the masses have issued such persistent and angry demands for the reconsideration of the famous decision of the December (1979) NATO session on the plan to deploy American cruise missiles in Western Europe in 1983, and are also opposing the U.S. hope of foisting the neutron bomb on the Western European NATO countries.

The unprecedented development of the present stage in the antiwar movement in Western Europe has been largely due to spontaneous mass opposition to the danger of war. At the same time, progressive segments of the laboring public and their allies have analyzed current advances in the antiwar movement and are striving to update the programs of a general democratic nature with a view to new developments connected with the struggle for peace and security in Europe. The current stage of the resistance movement has also engendered new democratic organizations, which have enriched the content and form of direct participation by the working class and by sensible members of the bourgeoisie in the resolution of international problems which could determine the future of the entire continent.

This is the reason for the increased interest displayed in the European antiwar movement by politicians and scholars.¹ The latter hope to analyze the actual potential of this movement, its ability to influence, in conjunction with other peaceful forces on our planet, the struggle to prevent wars; what is more, this is being done at an extremely crucial time, now that the U.S. ruling elite is trying to further its own selfish interests by once again, just as in the ill-reputed J. F. Dulles' time, attempting to force the Europeans to accept scenarios in which their continent is assigned the unenviable role of the most probable target of nuclear war.

Antiwar issues often occupy a central place in scholarly debates and in heated ideological and political battles. An example of this can be found in the idea that "American strategic thinking is qualitatively and quantitatively superior to the European brand," whose author, American analyst Ken Booth, regards the European antiwar movement as a Lilliputian mob incapable of fully understanding and properly assessing the exalted geopolitical plans of the American Gulliver.² Some bourgeois political scientists are trying to portray participants in the antiwar movement as "superfluous people," people who are broken and disillusioned, people who are tired and afraid of Spengler's gloomy predictions about Europe's inevitable decline, people who are exacerbating the already tense atmosphere in international relations. In connection with this, the antiwar movement is regarded as something just short of a movement of fear. It is precisely "commonsense and objectivity," however, precisely the same carefully considered approach to the issues of war and peace, written about two centuries ago by the great French humanist philosopher D. Diderot, that constitute the primary cause of this antiwar movement with no parallel in European history.

On the other hand, several foreign politicians, and ones on the highest level, are falsifying the deep-seated, fundamental causes of the powerful upsurge in the antiwar movement at the turn of the decade, replacing them with the hackneyed thesis about "the hand of Moscow." It is as if the Europeans cannot sense the fatal consequences of the arms race, which is impeding the resolution of major economic and social problems; it is as if they have no right to cherish the completely natural hope of saving themselves, their children and the spiritual and material elements of the European civilization from nuclear or any other kind of destruction.

The humanitarian essence of the struggle for peace and the reactionary nature of the attempts to counter this struggle with the imperialist doctrine of "limited nuclear war," "the secondary importance of peace," "the dependence of peace on the escalation of the nuclear arms race" and so forth are particularly apparent in today's tense atmosphere. Reality itself, however, is proving that V. I. Lenin was absolutely justified in calling for constant progress toward a truly lasting peace for all people. "The question of war and peace," he said, "is the most vivid reflection of democracy,"³ Lenin's belief has been properly implemented in the Program of Peace put forth at the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses.

The comparison of such contradictory doctrines and ideas and the very course of the present fierce battle between forces for war and peace unavoidably lead the members of antiwar demonstrations to extremely symptomatic conclusions. It is not surprising that even slogans like "Better red than dead" and "No Euroshimas"

began to appear on the banners of spontaneous antiwar demonstrations. It would seem that the hawks overseas should have given this some thought and revised their plans to escalate tension and to eradicate the achievements of detente, but they had a different reaction.

We can therefore predict that, as the scheduled date for the deployment of the new medium-range missiles in Europe draws near, the struggle for peace will grow more intense and acquire increasingly profound content and that the antiwar demonstrations of 1982-1983 might surpass the massive antiwar actions of 1981 in terms of their geographic and social scales. According to spokesmen of various Western European groups, the intimidating consequences of the events in Poland cannot prevent the further development of the struggle against the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The Europeans, West Germany's SPIEGEL reported, are gathering only by the hundreds to protest the events in Poland, but hundreds of thousands are attending protest rallies against the deployment of American missiles in Europe.⁴

According to public opinion polls, the increase in military spending planned under U.S. pressure is supported by only one-third of the British, 15 percent of the West Germans and less than 10 percent of the Belgians and Netherlands. These extremely convincing figures were published along with comments about the anticipated "rending of the fabric of mutual interest that was woven with such care by the United States and Western Europe for 30 years."⁵

Growth of Antiwar Feelings in Western Europe
(sample survey data)

Country	Against U.S. missiles (%)		For U.S. missiles (%)	
	1980	1981	1980	1981
England	43	53	49	41
Belgium	42	66	26	19
Holland	53	68	39	28
FRG	--	39	--	29

Source: THE ECONOMIST, 31 October 1981; TIME, 30 November 1981

The anxiety that is periodically expressed in the bourgeois press over neutralist tendencies in Western Europe is indicative. "In France," THE ECONOMIST stressed, "public opinion is more neutral than in any other large Western European country. The people there are not enthusiastic about returning to the NATO military organization, and a 1980 public opinion poll indicated that if war should break out between the two superpowers, 63 percent of the French would prefer to remain neutral and only 22 percent believe that their country should take the side of the United States."⁶

There has been an unquestionable shift in the direction of neutralism. The antiwar demonstrations, TIME reports, "are organized by a heterogeneous and loosely bound but strong coalition, which has become a formidable power in England, the FRG, Italy, Belgium and Holland. If this coalition is not stopped, it could turn NATO into a meaningless concept and overstrain the tenuous bounds connecting America with the continent."⁷

In this atmosphere of international tension and arms race escalation, either model of Western European neutralism--with or without withdrawal from NATO--is completely possible but both will be aimed at foreign policy independence. The probability of this result is corroborated by the example of the non-alignment policy that grew out of the national liberation struggle. The antiwar movement of the laboring public is virtually accelerating the evolution of Western European policy in the direction of neutralism. No matter how limited or localized the preference for a neutralist policy might be in the European countries, the very fact that it exists threatens the overseas advocates of the arms race with the most complex consequences.

Thinking in "Gulliverian" terms, American conservative politicians are cold-bloodedly ignoring the "Lilliputians'" attempt to escape the dangerous zone of possible nuclear conflict by moving into the sphere of neutralism. The escalation of militaristic hysteria, however, and all of the related possibilities of a nuclear conflict in Europe are, in the words of H. Sonnenfeldt, one of Henry Kissinger's former advisers, "not mere differences of opinion," but "the most acute political conflicts"⁸--from Reykjavik to Athens, from Helsinki to Lisbon.

The following data provides some idea of the unprecedented growth of the Western European antiwar movement, both in terms of growth rates and in absolute figures: In 1981 more than 6 million people took part in antiwar demonstrations. The most powerful demonstrations and rallies took place in 1981, when around 2 million demonstrators marched down the streets of Bonn, London, Rome, Amsterdam and other European capitals. The most impressive demonstrations often included from 150,000 to 500,000 vehemently protesting supporters of peace. This was the case, for example, in Amsterdam on 21 November 1981, in Bonn on 10 October 1981, in London on 30 May 1981, in Madrid on 15 November 1981 and in Lisbon on 17 January 1982. "For each group of demonstrators there is a tremendous number of people who stay home but share exactly the same feelings," G. Ball, former U.S. under secretary of state, said with alarm.⁹

These massive demonstrations (including the reserve antiwar movement) are being called the "antimissile explosion." Some Western news sources have related this phenomenon directly to the public debut of a new generation of Western Europeans, who were raised in the fertile soil of international detente and who therefore know from their own experience that peaceful coexistence by states with differing social structures is necessary.

A survey conducted in the FRG, for example, indicated that the deployment of American missiles is opposed by 70 percent of the West Germans between the ages of 13 and 25 (more than 11 million people).¹⁰ Heinrich Boll believes that "grandparents who remember the devastation caused by conventional wars have passed their memories on to their grandchildren."¹¹ These young people, including students, have often declared: "We grew up in an atmosphere where everything around us reminded us of our terrible past, and now we are a nation saturated with nuclear weapons over which we have no control."¹²

The tendency toward an increase in the number of participants in the antiwar movement of the 1980's is characteristic of all Western Europe. According to the well-informed American magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, "the new generation of Western Europeans, as public opinion polls testify, are much less likely than their

parents to support NATO and much more likely to support neutrality. Besides this, this part of the population, just as other strata, is marked by widespread dissatisfaction with the inability of governments to cope with economic, social and political crises.

"Another factor contributing to the antinuclear feelings of youth is the reluctance to accept the idea that nuclear war is conceivable."¹³

Some generals and admirals who have held leading positions in the armed forces of the NATO countries are opposing the fatal inevitability of nuclear war in Europe. The recent publication of a book by prominent West German scholar and journalist G. Kade, "Generals for Peace," about a group of prominent representatives of the bourgeois military intelligentsia, has shed new light on, and has given new interpretations for, many of the questions and stereotypes pertaining to leading military experts. The decision made by the military men portrayed in this book to support disarmament, friendly relations with the socialist states and a policy of social progress is a sign that facts are being reassessed even within the military community.

Another peculiarity of the present stage in the antiwar movement is equally significant: the increasing percentage of participants who work in various fields of science and the professions and whose studies are reinforcing the arguments in favor of peace and the struggle to eliminate war as a means of settling disputes between states with differing social structures.

Many countries in Western Europe have been seized by widespread public discontent. Profound indignation at the social, political and economic consequences of the exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism is now accompanied by offended national feelings and worries about the fate of Europe as a whole. Many Europeans see imperialism itself, the irresponsible behavior of the military-industrial complex and the intrigues of its aggressive spokesmen as the chief source of military danger. They realize that traditional diplomacy alone is not enough at a time of such danger.

It is therefore time for "people's diplomacy," powerful in its direct impact on political parties, parliaments and other bourgeois democratic structures. It is already a convention to assume, and there are convincing grounds for this, that the formation of an opposition to the "euromissiles" within virtually each social democratic and bourgeois party in Western Europe is being influenced directly and indirectly by the antiwar feelings of the broad laboring masses. This is the chief strength of "people's diplomacy" as one of the most important signs of the democratization of international relations.

This is a phenomenon with a serious destabilizing effect on imperialism. The internationalization of antiwar demonstrations, in conjunction with the strong leftist opposition to the apparent rightward shift, can complicate imperialism's existence in individual countries and in regional groups in Western Europe. Rightwing forces, particularly in the United States, England, Italy and some other countries and organizations, including the European Parliament, have been unable, despite all of their efforts, to obtain the total "allied solidarity" they

expected on major questions of war and peace. The increasing activity of belligerent militarists who insist on the escalation of tension is being accompanied by the serious growth of the antiwar movement, whose participants are demanding the cessation of the arms race and the preservation and consolidation of detente. There is no question that this movement, with its unprecedented dimensions and spectrum of political forces, is already creating a new continental situation in the democratic camp of fighters for peace and social progress.

Several officials from various Western European parties and organizations, including in the FRG, formed an alliance with the antiwar movement in 1980 and 1981. Active and authoritative opponents of NATO's peace-endangering decision were even found within the CDU/CSU. The antiwar struggle over the "euromissiles" proved that many members of the SPD and FDP, including Bundestag deputies, along with labor union activists, communists and Christians, in the FRG were among the instigators of massive demonstrations against the nuclear threat and for disarmament and detente in Europe. Labor unions are gaining a broader, deeper and more accurate understanding of the objectives of the struggle against the arms race as the antiwar movement develops. Their strength lies in their close contacts with these people and in their ability to listen to the people and pay attention to what they say. Among the labor unions' responses to the antiwar feelings of the masses were the reconversion plans drawn up in a number of branches of the Association of German Trade Unions and the strikes at enterprises manufacturing military products. The constant debates in the Bundestag over questions connected with the deployment of the new American medium-range missiles in the FRG, the confusion and hesitation with which the governing coalition has responded to the peremptory tone of the particular segment of the voting public that objects to this deployment, the appearance of various groups within parties who object to American authoritarianism and, finally, the quite frequent disagreements with Washington over the FRG's Eastern policy all provide different but extremely convincing proof of the antiwar movement's strong influence in Bonn's official circles.

The antiwar movement is also drawing broad segments of the British population into the whirlpool of events. The dissatisfaction of laborers in this country, who are demanding not only that the deployment of American nuclear weapons on their territory be prohibited but also that their own production of missiles be ceased, is an external sign of the profound discontent of the popular masses with the policy of the Conservatives. It is no coincidence that the huge English labor marches against unemployment and demonstrations against the arms race often find expression in a single slogan: "We want jobs, not bombs." The roots of this widespread public discontent are extremely deep and are connected with major social and economic issues, and this is why urgent political problems, concerning future national policy and the state of the government, are rising to the surface, as they usually do during periods of spontaneous popular demonstrations. It is significant that the deep concern displayed by some Labor opposition leaders about the need to curb the nuclear arms race is closely interwoven with their desire to defeat the belligerent Conservatives. It is quite indicative that most members of the Labor Party are not supporting the acquisition of Trident submarines or the deployment of cruise missiles and neutron weapons in England, but are in favor of Soviet-American nuclear arms limitation talks. Their political sense tells them the correct interpretation of the peculiarities of the current situation, which is largely connected with the mounting antiwar feelings of the laboring public, the

echoes of which are heard throughout England. If the English voters had to choose between the Labor and Conservative parties today, the scales would probably tip in Labor's favor, as the data of the Gallup Institute testify.

Unfortunately, contemporary historians still do not have enough information about the effect of the laboring public's antiwar pressure on the policy of the Western European governments. They must be content with isolated reports and indirect proof, which leave room for further, more thorough analysis.

For example, it is obvious that antiwar feelings are not reflected in their entirety in the fierce struggles between rightist and leftist forces over a broad group of foreign and domestic policy issues in France. This could be due to France's unique status in the North Atlantic alliance. The plans to build up American nuclear strength on the European continent have been staunchly opposed by the French Communist Party, France's largest labor organization, the CGT, members of the French peace movement and many Socialists and Gaullists who are sickened by the very thought that Europe--and, therefore, France--might become a hostage of the United States.

The Union of Democrats for the Republic (UDR) is probably the only major political force in France that supports the United States' ambitious policy in Western Europe. The United States naturally finds this position appealing. It is no coincidence that some American authors have even tried to say that France's prestige depends on its support of the NATO decisions on "rearming" and "restoring the Eurostrategic balance" that has supposedly been violated by the Soviet Union in its own favor, and have implied that this will enhance France's authority and reputation in Western Europe.

French Marxists justifiably believe that the struggle for radical reforms in the country and the attempts to curb unemployment and inflation and solve other pressing internal problems are closely connected with the struggle for peace and disarmament. Representatives of the working class and other progressive forces supporting the French Government's efforts to improve social security, collect more taxes from the rich and accelerate economic development and the nationalization of the main branches of industry have noted with alarm that all of those who are on the side of big capital are angry about the growth of the economy's public sector and are trying to prevent it. One of the results of this is the outflow of capital from the country. At the same time, France is spending considerable sums to carry out its military and political plans in Western Europe. This is why the most consistent supporters of leftist forces are increasingly likely to realize that a struggle for social reforms is unthinkable without a struggle against the arms race. The demand for disarmament, speakers stressed at the 24th PCF Congress, has become the distinctive feature of our times. In this connection, the French communist congress reaffirmed the importance of the class solidarity of the European workers movement and its unity in the struggle for social progress, peace and cooperation on the continent.

The antiwar movement in Italy is developing under extremely difficult conditions (governmental instability, economic collapse and terrorism). Domestic political tension is being exacerbated by the bourgeois propaganda about the Soviet Union's alleged disruption of the balance of power in Europe.

Certain circles in the West are trying to take advantage of some of the specific features of the antiwar movement, which it, just as any other complex and new phenomenon, is now displaying. On the one hand, it is being interpreted as a purely anti-American and even pro-Soviet movement. On the other hand, it has been alleged that the antiwar demonstrators all have the same attitude toward the foreign policy lines of the great powers.

Aside from these false interpretations, most of the analysts of the antiwar movement agree that, as a broad social complex made up of representatives of various democratic forces, it reflects all of the diverse reactions of the masses to the arms race and their struggle for the right to live in peace.

Antiwar tendencies in the Benelux countries are extremely indicative. According to the unanimous testimony of Western observers, the members of the antiwar resistance in Holland and Belgium are waging a particularly vigorous struggle against the euromissiles. In fall 1981, apparently under the influence of the successes of this struggle, a coalition government of Christian democrats, leftist radicals and socialists was formed in Holland. A broad antiwar front of various women's, youth and labor organizations and the traditionally influential church organizations has taken shape in the country. The political atmosphere in Holland sometimes reaches the boiling point. In this country "there is no possibility of consent to the deployment of cruise missiles," LE MONDE reported.¹⁴ The situation has gone so far that groups close to the American military establishment feel that Holland all but initiated the demoralization of NATO plans. This country, just as other Western European countries, has placed great hopes in the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear stockpiles in Europe. Under the pressure of the masses, ruling circles in Holland are constantly postponing the final decision on the deployment of euromissiles within this country. Furthermore, in an attempt to soothe public opinion, they are even prepared to consider cuts in Holland's contribution to the NATO nuclear program.

Antiwar feelings and the spirit of pacifist "criticism" are growing stronger with each day in Belgium. The gap between the demands of disarmament's numerous supporters, in spite of all the disagreements between the Flemish and Walloon communities, and NATO's plans has almost reached its extreme. The country is in a state of permanent political crisis and socioeconomic difficulties. Under these conditions, the old Atlantic approach to ally obligations is not working as automatically as it once did. The Belgian people, accompanied--or more precisely, led--by their many political, public, pacifist and religious organizations, are insisting on the reconsideration of the NATO decision on the euromissiles. In Belgium, just as in other Western European countries, these conflicts are becoming increasingly overt and are growing into huge demonstrations and rallies appealing for an end to the arms race and the concentration of efforts on the resolution of acute socioeconomic problems. As a result of this, the "rebellious spirit" which has seized the country is paralyzing the Belgian Government in its attempts to comply with NATO instructions.

The situation is approximately the same in Scandinavia. Many Norwegians and Danes are demanding a world without euromissiles and American weapon stockpiles and are opposing the emplacement of NATO military arsenals within their territory. These issues have evoked heated debates during sessions of parliament and during

demonstrations and rallies, many of which are headed by leftist organizations. It is extremely significant that an event which clearly reflected the anxieties and hopes of northern Europe in general took place at the 28th congress of the Swedish Social Democrats--more than 300 congress delegates sang the pacifist hymn about "a world without soldiers and rifles" right in the congress auditorium.

Events in other parts of Europe testify that leftist forces can counter the outdated programs of conservative regimes with their own positive program of peace, envisaging, as current events in Greece testify, the revival of democracy and social progress, connected indissolubly with a struggle to create nuclear-free zones and to withdraw from NATO.

In the eyes of the Greek people, the North Atlantic bloc has become a living anachronism, particularly after the Cyprus crisis. Demonstrations against foreign military bases and appeals for a contribution "befitting the memory of Hellas" to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans became much more energetic after the election victory of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement, with which many Greeks associate their hopes for genuine national revival.

Antiwar opposition has become an integral part of the activities of progressive forces in Portugal and Spain, and this is having an indisputable effect on domestic politics in these countries. After encountering impressive antimissile opposition, the Portuguese Government has employed the tactic of "relaxation therapy," which essentially consists in promises that no decision will be made on the deployment of American medium-range missiles without the consent of the public.

The Spanish Government has had to resort to intricate maneuvers for the same reasons. It is trying to combine membership in NATO with a guaranteed non-nuclear status. Representatives of leftist forces have correctly pointed out, however, that Spain's best guarantee against the possibility of euromissile deployment is a refusal to join the North Atlantic bloc.

Obviously, the antiwar movement in each specific country has its own distinctive features and cannot be a mere repetition of the experience of other countries. There is no standard model of antiwar resistance that is suitable for every time and every country in Western Europe. Much in the movement depends on the current international situation, the policy of the ruling party or coalition, the degree to which antiwar ideals have entered the minds and hearts of millions of people and, finally, on the maturity of the working class, its progressive organizations and so forth.

"We are relying completely on the peaceful nature of not only workers and peasants," V. I. Lenin once wrote, "but also many sensible members of the bourgeoisie and government."¹⁵

A concrete analysis of the problems of the antiwar movement proves that the significance of this idea has grown immeasurably. The matter has been elucidated well in the authoritative journal *BLATTER FÜR DEUTSCHE UND INTERNATIONALE POLITIK*, expressing the progressive views of the FRG public. "It is too soon for the peace movement to give up the struggle," K. Bredthauer, prominent spokesman of the antiwar movement, wrote in this journal. "Who else today (including in Geneva) can

defend our national and European interests with the necessary persistence and without keeping a fearful watch on Washington? It is a good thing that the East and West have at least resumed their dialogue in Geneva, but considering their initial positions, it is clear that the dialogue will produce results only under constant and strong pressure from the European and American peace movements. The movement now has to pass the test of focusing energy on cardinal strategic issues and on political and public opposition to the 'rearming' decision."¹⁶

There is an objective need for a united front supporting the practical resolution of our urgent world problems, especially disarmament, because no single element of the peace movement is strong enough on its own to attain constructive results in the resolution of problems connected with medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons, the banning of chemical weapons, etc.

The grievous experience of two world wars and a cold war and, on the other hand, the productive results of detente as the only alternative to the repetition of the European tragedy, but on the nuclear level this time, are compelling many Europeans and, recently, large segments of the American public to actively oppose the ambitious militaristic plans of the NATO countries, with the United States in the lead. The success of the struggle against the nuclear threat and for the revival of international detente will depend largely on the effective concentration of new forces fighting against aggression and war in this important sphere of the movement for peace and European security.

FOOTNOTES

1. See "Antivoyennyye traditsii mezhdunarodnogo rabocheho dvizheniya" [The Antiwar Traditions of the International Workers Movement], Moscow, 1972; "Istoriya antivoyennogo dvizheniya v kapitalisticheskikh stranakh Yevropy (1945-1976)" [The History of the Antiwar Movement in the European Capitalist Countries (1945-1976)], Moscow, 1981; V. Shaposhnikov, "Some of the Problems of the Present-Day Antiwar Movement" (MEMO, 1981, No 12); I. Zhigalov, "The Public of Great Britain Against Neutron Weapons and Cruise Missiles," VOPROSY ISTORII, No 11, 1981; "New Stage of the Antiwar Struggle in Western Europe," MEMO, 1982, No 1; Ye. Silin, "The Antimissile Explosion of Public Indignation in Europe," MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', 1982, No 1; also see, in this issue, "The Antiwar Positions of Labor Unions in the Developed Capitalist Countries at the Present Stage (Survey)."
2. "American Thinking About Peace and War," 1978, N.Y., p 28.
3. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 92.
4. DER SPIEGEL, 11 January 1982.
5. TIME, 30 November 1981.
6. THE ECONOMIST, 31 October 1981.

7. TIME, 30 November 1981.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 9 November 1981.
14. Quoted in: ZA RUBEZHOM, 1981, No 46.
15. V. I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 44, p 287.
16. BLATTER FUR DEUTSCHE UND INTERNATIONALE POLITIK, 1981, I-XII.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

POINTS OF CONTACT, DISAGREEMENT WITH LATIN AMERICAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 132-147

[Article by E. S. Dabagyan: "Ideological and Political Concepts of Latin American Social Democrats"]

[Text] The social democratic type of ideology is one of the ideological currents whose influence has grown perceptibly in recent decades in the Latin American and Caribbean countries. The spread of this kind of ideology throughout this region is the logical result of a process with two closely related facets. One is the considerable interest an increasing number of reformist parties on this continent have displayed in the theory and practice of worldwide social democracy and the other is the Socialist International's increased interest in this part of the world, which led in the late 1960's and early 1970's to the formation and implementation of a new strategy, one of the important elements of which was the cultivation of social democratic ideas in the consciousness of the Latin American general public.

Genesis and Developmental Stages of the Social Democratic Type of Ideology in Latin America

The establishment and development of a social democratic type of ideology on the continent represent a complex and multifaceted process. Several stages can be distinguished in this evolution. In its present form, this ideology reflects various ideological currents rooted in the historical traditions of the countries of this continent.

The social democratic ideology is now being promoted in Latin America by political parties and movements that make up a broad and fairly diverse spectrum but nevertheless fall into a single distinct category, namely the category of parties with a social democratic orientation. The main criteria and characteristics of this type of party are: The acceptance of the Socintern ideologists' interpretations of the concepts of the "third path" and "democratic socialism"; the extensive adoption of the theories and practices of European social democrats, particularly the parties which are or were in power for a long time; a recognition of the common philosophical concepts of their own parties and the European social democrats; gradual convergence with the European parties inside and outside the Socintern framework;¹ joint theoretical and ideological work by the Latin American parties within a centralized framework for the purpose of adapting and altering social democratic doctrines and postulates to fit regional and national conditions.

When the parties of the social democratic type are being discussed as a group, it must be borne in mind that their levels of social democratization vary: Some are just embarking on this path while others have already moved quite far in this direction. They can be divided conditionally into four groups. The first group consists of parties which have been full-fledged members of the Socintern for a long time. They include the Socialist Confederation of Argentina (previously called the Socialist Party of Argentina), the Radical Party (Chile), the People's National Party (Jamaica) and the Barbados Labor Party. The development and spread of the social democratic type of ideology in Latin America is connected primarily with the activities of the Socialist Party of Argentina (PSA) which was one of the few Latin American members of the Second Internationale. It was founded at the very end of the 19th century. The PSA's departure from class, revolutionary positions and its move to a social reformist position occurred after the Great October Socialist Revolution. The ideological and political division within the PSA ended with the withdrawal of revolutionary groups from the party. In 1918 they formed the Communist Party of Argentina. At that time the PSA began to promote a social reformist ideology. The party's subsequent evolution caused it to accept the concept of "democratic socialism" in the spirit in which it was formulated at the congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany in Bad Godesberg. At the end of the 1950's a PSA national convention ratified a policy-planning document entitled "New Bases and Points of Departure for the Construction of a Free and Just Argentina in the 20th Century," which bore the imprint of the latest concepts with which world social democrats had armed themselves.² The PSA, just as a number of other socialist parties which are no longer visible on the political stage, can be relegated to the first generation of parties promoting the social democratic type of ideology in Latin America. It was on these parties that the Socintern relied during the first postwar decade when it conducted its strategic line in this part of the world. One of the indisputable weaknesses of these parties was their inclination to transplant social democratic concepts to Latin America mechanically, without any consideration for specific historical conditions, and this ultimately led to their failure.

The second group, or generation, of parties is the largest. It is made up of so-called national reformists or people's parties. They include the Peruvian Popular (Aprista) Party, the Democratic Action Party (Venezuela), the People's Electoral Movement (Venezuela), the National Liberation Party (Costa Rica), both factions of the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (Bolivia), the Dominican Revolutionary Party and the Febrerista Revolutionary Party (Paraguay). The ideology of national reformism, which came into being in the late 1920's and early 1930's, reflected the desire of the top strata of the petty bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie to propose their own, reformist alternative of Latin American development at a time when the main classes in the capitalist society--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--were weak and when the confrontation between the two social systems--capitalism and socialism--was taking on worldwide dimensions.

When the national reformist parties were founded, their theoretical and political principles of reformism--their salient feature--were clothed in nationalist garb. The need to institute reforms instead of taking the path proposed by Communists was substantiated by references to the specific nature of Latin America, its

"dissimilarity" to other countries, especially in Europe, its "special" position in the world capitalist system and imperialism's "unique" functions in this part of the world.

Nevertheless, the principal feature of the national reformist ideology--the attempt to substantiate the possibility of transforming sociopolitical structures without revolutionary change--revealed its similarity to European social democracy. Even the leaders of these parties have to acknowledge the presence of an ideological link connecting their parties with European social democrats. At that time, however, the theorists of national reformism did not attach primary significance to characteristics of this type in ideology and political practice; on the contrary, they emphasized the originality, novelty and uniqueness of their ideology.³

After World War II, particularly after the middle of the 1960's, the national reformist leaders had to analyze changes taking place in the world and within their countries and adapt their doctrines to new conditions. While leftist radical groups were considering the socialist alternative, leftist centrist and rightist groups began to keep an eye on the European social democrats and arm themselves with their fundamental theories. Under these new conditions, the ideologists of these parties were inclined to shift the emphasis in their arguments in favor of the reformist alternative. When they spoke of the need to continue the reformist line, they made references not only to the specific conditions of Latin America but also to the experience of the European states where social democratic parties were carrying out a social experiment that seemed to the national reformist leaders to be completely suitable for their own countries as well.

The third group is made up of parties that have just recently declared their adherence to the ideals of social democracy and the principles of "democratic socialism," as well as parties formed in the 1970's. They include the National Revolutionary Movement (El Salvador), the Democratic Socialist Party (Guatemala), the Left Democratic Party (Ecuador), the Honduran Revolutionary Party, the Working People's Alliance (Guyana), the People's Electoral Movement (Aruba) and others. One of the distinctive features of this group of parties is that their progression toward social democratic ideals did not take long, and in some cases their acceptance of these ideals dates back to the time of the parties' founding. This applies, for example, to the Left Democratic Party of Ecuador and the Honduran Revolutionary Movement. When they were founded in the second half of the 1970's, they immediately identified themselves with world social democrats. The probable reason is that they took shape on the crest of the social democratic wave by which the countries of this continent were engulfed throughout the 1970's. Some of these parties were formed with outside participation and judging by all indications, they still face the difficult task of finding their own place in the political structure of their countries.

The fourth group is made up of parties and movements in which social democratic tendencies have been gaining the upper hand in a struggle against other currents in recent years. The main ones are the Institutional Revolutionary Party of Mexico, the Radical Civic Union of Argentina, the Brazilian Democratic Movement (until 1980), The Liberal Party in Colombia and several others. The peculiarities

of this group of parties are illustrated by the example of the Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB). It was founded after the 1964 coup as the only legal opposition party and has represented a diverse conglomerate of different currents and tendencies since that time. In the 1970's its social democratic segment became perceptibly stronger and more assertive. This wing of the MDB established close contacts with the leaders of the Socintern and regularly sent its representatives to Socintern conferences and other forums, including the pan-Latin American forum held under the aegis of the Socintern. In 1980, when a reform of the party system was being implemented, this wing formed the Partido Trabalhista Democrático and issued a policy-planning statement of a clearly defined social democratic nature. It also proclaimed itself the heir to the ideals and traditions of Brazilian Trabalhism whose roots go back to G. Vargas (see NUEVA SOCIEDAD, San Jose, 1980, No 50, pp 182-183. Further references to this publication will indicate only the year, number and page).

This is certainly not a complete list of Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation. The main reasons are that, firstly, the process of the formation of new parties and organizations is still going on and, secondly, the specific political situation in some countries is forcing parties to regroup and change their names.⁴

Joint theoretical and ideological work by parties is an integral part of the process by which the social democratic ideology is disseminated. It is conducted within the framework of two institutions: The journal NUEVA SOCIEDAD, which is actually an unofficial Socintern organ, and the Center for the Study of Democracy in Latin America (CEDAL), which operates with the financial support of the West German Friedrich Ebert Fund.

One purpose of CEDAL work is the theoretical substantiation of the natural laws governing the spread of the social democratic ideology on the continent and a search for ways of adapting and altering social democratic doctrines to conform to regional and national realities.⁵

When we analyze the ideological and political concepts with which the Latin American social democrats have armed themselves, we must bear the following in mind.

First of all, the level of capitalist development attained by many Latin American countries, the formation of elements of state-monopoly capitalism in some of them, the sharp exacerbation of social and class antagonism, the growing size of the working class and its higher level of professional organization, and the proletariat's evolution into a leading political force are all working together to establish an objective basis for the more intensive dissemination of the social democratic ideology on the continent. At the same time, the Latin American countries, along with the developing countries of Asia and Africa, still occupy a subordinate position in the world capitalist system. Rightwing authoritarian dictatorships have been established in many countries of this continent, and the laborers in these countries have been unable to achieve political and social gains like the ones achieved by the laboring public in the developed capitalist countries, where ruling social democratic parties are striving to put the model of "democratic socialism" into practice. This is naturally having a significant

effect on the ideological postulates of the Latin American social democrats. A feature which distinguishes this ideology from the European variety is its combination of social democratic theories with theories about the so-called Third World and its retention of many of the original features inherent in the ideological currents from which this ideological and political movement evolved.

Secondly, the Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation are distinguished by extreme diversity. There are significant differences both between and within parties in regard to the interpretation of fundamental ideological and political concepts. In contrast to the European parties, many of the Latin American parties identify themselves with rightwing-centrist currents in the Socintern. For example, the present ideologists of the Democratic Action Party (Venezuela) are inclined to agree with the concepts of the German Social Democratic Party's leaders; as for the National Liberation Party (Costa Rica), it is being influenced by, among others, Israel's social democrats, with whom it established particularly close and deep ties and contacts in the 1970's. On the other hand, such parties as, for example, the People's Electoral Movement (Venezuela), People's National Party of Jamaica and the National Revolutionary Movement (El Salvador) can be relegated to the left-centrist and left wing of international social democracy.

The disclosure of distinctions and nuances, an important part of the study of ideologies of the social democratic type, is of political as well as purely theoretical significance. We will concentrate on this in our analysis of the fundamental doctrines with which the Latin American social democrats have armed themselves.

'Democratic Socialism'

The focus of the sociopolitical doctrine of Latin American social democrats, just as of social democrats in Europe, is the concept of "democratic socialism," which, in turn, rests on the thesis regarding the possibility of choosing a so-called "third path" of development.

Now that the confrontation between the two social systems--socialism and capitalism--is growing more intense with each year, Socintern theorists and the leaders of many Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation are declaring the need to search for a "third path," differing both from real socialism and from capitalism. In unison with the ideologists of world social democracy, they are declaring that neither capitalism nor real socialism can solve mankind's major problems. The following two statements are enough to corroborate their common views on this fundamental issue.

When W. Brandt spoke at the 13th Socintern Congress (1976), he said, referring to the two opposing systems: "Mankind's great hopes have not been realized in America or Russia.... This is precisely why...social democrats have the great responsibility of proposing their own alternative" (1977, No 28, p 140). The same idea has been expressed more than once by C. A. Perez, the former president of Venezuela and one of the leaders of the Democratic Action Party. "We social democrats," he wrote, "are distinguished by the conviction that neither capitalism nor communism can offer mankind the best possible future" (1977, No 31-32, p 6).

According to the leaders of many Latin American reformist parties, under these conditions, European social democrats are offering mankind the most suitable course of action. No one, according to C. A. Perez, can sympathize more with the aspirations of Latin America than social democrats, "who have declared that the principal values determining mankind's destiny are the dignity of free people and universal justice based on equality" (1976, No 24, p 15).

Social democratic ideals permeate the policy-planning declarations of the Left Democratic Party (Ecuador) and Honduran Revolutionary Party, founded in 1976 and 1977 respectively (1977, No 28, pp 151-156; No 33, pp 182-190).

The "Ideological Charter" of the Costa Rican Democratic Labor Federation, which is under the political control of the National Liberation Party, states that the struggle of the laboring public for a just society can only be victorious within a social democratic framework. This is why, the document stresses, "we are striving for social democracy as an economic and social system" (1976, No 26, p 165).

The logical result of the social democratization of Latin American reformist parties and currents was their acceptance of the concept of "democratic socialism," borrowed from the ideological arsenal of the European social democrats, their inclusion of this concept in their theoretical and policy-planning documents and their widespread use and manipulation of its basic postulates in their daily political practices. For example, one of the documents signed jointly by leaders of European and Latin American parties (1979) unequivocally states: "We are convinced that the alternative corresponding most to the culture of the people of this region, their traditions and their historic need for independence, is democratic socialism--a viable ideological system for the Latin American and Caribbean countries" (1979, No 41, p 206).

According to the ideologists of reformist parties, "democratic socialism" signifies a society differing both from the present form of socialism and from capitalism. "Democratic socialism," in their opinion, signifies a society of "social democracy," which supposedly combines the best features of socialism and capitalism. According to their argument, these two systems are equally unsuitable for the developing countries. Socialism is unsuitable because it allegedly restricts individual freedom and makes the individual subordinate to the society, and capitalism is unsuitable because it allows a privileged minority to dominate an absolute majority of the population. These ideas also lie at the basis of the final resolution of the Caracas Conference (1976), which was attended by leaders of socialist, social democratic and related parties in Europe and Latin America. The resolution underscores the belief that the establishment of "social democracy" is not the exclusive privilege of industrially developed countries; this kind of regime is quite desirable and extremely necessary to the people of the developing countries as well (1976, No 24, p 68).

Adherence to the ideals of "democratic socialism" is clearly reflected in the "Ideological Charter" of the Costa Rican Democratic Labor Confederation. This policy-planning document, ratified in 1977, says that the confederation is striving for "social democracy as a system of economic and societal organization." The Costa Rican workers, the charter stresses, prefer "democratic socialism" because

"no political democracy can exist if the economic system is isolated from society, and socialism cannot exist without the basic freedoms that are only exercised in the presence of democracy" (1976, No 26, p 165).

The platform declaration of the Honduran Revolutionary Party is invested with the same spirit--the spirit of the principles of "democratic socialism." In particular, it says: "Democratic socialism can be realized only in the presence of democracy, and democracy, in turn, cannot be achieved without democratic socialism (1977, No 33, p 182).

Upholding a slogan coined by the Socintern leaders, C. Morales, a member of Chile's Radical Party leadership, announced at a conference of representatives of Latin American social democratic parties: "There is no socialism without democracy and no democracy without socialism" (1977, No 30, p 97).

Two common features are apparent in the theoretical constructs of Latin American and European social democratic ideologists. The first is the absence of a complete, detailed and thoroughly substantiated description of the societal structure implied by the term "democratic socialism," and the other is the presence of the most diverse interpretations of this term.

The parties which adhere essentially to the rightist-centrist interpretation of "democratic socialism" are distinguished by extremely vague and confused descriptions of the societal system to which the term "democratic socialism" refers. A Statement by R. Borja, leader of Ecuador's Left Democratic Party, is indicative in this connection. He said: "We social democrats are antidogmatic.... There are no eternal truths. Everything can and must be questioned, and ideologies are living organisms which take shape gradually: Some of their parts die while others are being born.... We have no sacred socialist writings, no ready-made eternal truths and no sacramental formulas. Everything must be questioned and debated" (1980, No 48, p 122).

The theorists of these parties, who once invariably took the role of zealous advocates of the system of bourgeois "representative democracy " now say that one of the main reasons for their turn toward "democratic socialism" was the fact that formal democracy proved ineffective and displayed its lack of substance under Latin American conditions. In particular, the leaders of the Democratic Action (Venezuela) and National Liberation (Costa Rica) Parties learned this from their own experience during many years in power. Contrary to the predictions of the parties' ideologists, the fundamental problems restricting the interests of the broad laboring masses were not solved in these years. This is why "democratic socialism" was put on the agenda. In their opinion, it represents a qualitatively different form of democracy. It is supposedly a democracy of equality and participation, guaranteeing the more just distribution of income, the right of laborers to make decisions, etc.

Most of the party documents of the Latin American social democrats imply that the state will concern itself with the common good and will regulate social relations in the society of "democratic socialism." The state, the abovementioned "Ideological Charter" says, is an instrument serving society. Its activities must be channeled in such a way as to "prevent the imbalances that might occur if some groups are in a privileged position in relation to others" (1976, No 26, p 165).

According to the leaders of these parties, when the state performs its arbitration functions, it has the right to make demands of various social strata. For example, when C. A. Perez addressed businessmen, he said that "capitalization should not mean the increased concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.... Economic goals must be combined with social ones."⁶

What role do the ideologists of social democratic parties assign the laboring public, especially the working class, in the society of "democratic socialism"? Although they address widespread appeals to the working class, they are also trying to convince the proletariat that its task should consist in strengthening its own professional organizations as instruments of class pressure and protection against exploitation and that its future does not lie in independent struggle, but in integration in a new society in which the working class will be a full-fledged associate member and will therefore have an interest in its continuous reinforcement. One of the theorists of the Democratic Action Party, M. Bruni Selli, made the following statement: "The birth and subsequent consolidation of the democratic system necessitate the alliance of various progressive segments of society for the purpose of uniting the necessary resources and efforts. Laborers and their labor unions represent the most important element of this alliance, and without their participation all efforts aimed at democratization and social change will fail" (1979, No 43, p 153).

According to party ideologists, as a necessary part of the integration of the masses in the system of "social democracy," the laboring public must become accustomed to ownership and the number of persons owning private property must be increased. These ideas are being instilled in the mass mind most intensively by the Venezuelan and Costa Rican parties, which employ sociopsychological factors in their propaganda. They are trying to convince the masses that the instinct of the property owner is a feature inherent in every individual. For example, according to F. Morales, one of the leaders of the National Liberation Party's Liberationist Youth, Costa Rica is a middle-class country and a distinctive feature of its inhabitants is their love of property (1979, No 43, pp 128-129).

An analysis of rightist and rightist-centrist interpretations of the term "democratic socialism" reveals the converging views of Latin American and European social democrats on such cardinal sociopolitical issues as assessments of capitalism and real socialism, attitudes toward revolution and reforms, the role and functions of the state, the meaning of democracy, etc.

In this connection, it is no coincidence that many party leaders have stated that Latin America is an integral part of the West. This kind of statement is particularly characteristic of the leaders of the Peruvian, Costa Rican and Venezuelan parties. "Our young Latin American society," said C. A. Perez, for example, "belongs to the Western world.... Our cultural values are the values of the Western world" (1976, No 24, p 17).

The authors of the collective work "Ideyno-politicheskiye techeniya imperIALIZMA" [Ideological and Political Currents of Imperialism] correctly point out the fact that "rightwing social democratic leaders are definitely on the side of capitalism in the historic struggle between socialism and capitalism."⁷ This applies completely to the rightwing leaders of Latin American parties, who allied themselves

with international social democracy only after it had renounced Marxism as its ideological basis and after the parties themselves had ceased to be parties for the reform of the capitalist system and became parties for reform within the system.

It is significant, however, that, as we pointed out above, the Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation include parties and influential groups within parties that are inclined to give "democratic socialism" a different interpretation than rightist and rightist-centrist party leaders.

The leftist-centrist concept of "democratic socialism" is presented in a fairly orderly fashion in the works of D. Boersner, one of the main ideologists of the People's Electoral Movement (Venezuela), which identifies itself with the left-wing of world social democracy. As early as the mid 1960's, prior to the schism within the Democratic Action Party and the party's abandonment by certain groups which later formed a separate party, D. Boersner published a special work containing his own interpretation of "democratic socialism."

When Boersner first used the term "democratic socialism," he was referring to a political and social regime like the one established in the Scandinavian countries where social democratic parties have been in power for a long time. According to his testimony, while they were in power, they "were able to enact laws abolishing exploitative capitalism and establish democratic state capitalism or a mixed economy evolving into complete socialism."⁸

During the course of subsequent ideological evolution, Boersner and his party actually ceased to serve as apologists for the Scandinavian variety of "democratic socialism" and realized that, in spite of the definite social and political gains the laboring public in the Scandinavian countries had been able to win under social democratic governments, they did not obtain their main goal--mainly, the modification of the exploitative nature of capitalism. On the theoretical level, this motivated D. Boersner and his party to formulate a thesis regarding democracy of the socialist type as the party's final goal.

In recent years the interpretation given to the concept of "democratic socialism" by the leaders of the People's National Party of Jamaica (PNP) has undergone considerable evolution. By the beginning of the 1970's the ideologists of the PNP, especially M. Manley, were already interpreting "democratic socialism" in the same way as the leftist socialist theorists of the European Socialist parties. In the second half of the 1970's, however, under the influence of several foreign and domestic factors, including the fact that the party was the ruling one for a long time, the ideological outlook of the PNP leadership underwent changes which indicated a possible departure from the fundamental premises of "democratic socialism" and a move toward scientific socialism.

At the 40th national conference of the People's National Party in 1978, policy-planning documents were approved which envisaged the country's socialist orientation. This actually signified a departure from the concept of "democratic socialism." Explaining the PNP's new policy aims, M. Manley said in 1979: "Under the leadership of our party, our people began to determine their most immediate objectives of a national democratic nature. After making a definite choice in

favor of the non-capitalist course of development, we began to acquire control over the national economy and over our own natural resources, developing both the state sector and the cooperative sector of the economy and carrying out a fundamental program of agrarian reform."⁹

It must be said that the present PNP leadership is highly impressed by the socio-economic and political achievements of real socialism and regards the experience of the socialist community states as something of great value to the people of the developing countries. For example, the chairman of the PNP Women's Movement underscored the following when she visited Cuba in 1977: "For us Cuba has always been an example commanding our respect. The achievements of socialism are evident here. For a nation like ours, which is just beginning its journey along the non-capitalist road, Cuba's 18 years of experience seem extremely valuable."¹⁰

The importance of studying the experience of real socialism was also discussed by M. Manley during his official visit to the USSR and some other countries of the socialist community in 1979.

On the whole, the influence of leftist and leftist-centrist currents on the ideological premises of Latin American social democrats has been quite perceptible, especially in recent years. It has been reflected, for example, in the evolution of the views regarding a matter as important as the elaboration of means and methods of struggle for political and social democracy. Whereas only peaceful, non-violent and so-called democratic methods were considered in the past, the possibility of other means is now being discussed. "We," the resolution of the Socintern Committee on Latin America and the Caribbean session (September 1980) noted, "defend people's right to resort to an armed uprising when peaceful means of attaining freedom are blocked or do not exist." (1980, No 50, p 213).

Although party ideologists and leaders serve as apologists for "democratic socialism," they nonetheless warn against the mechanical adoption of models that have proved to be viable in a different set of historical circumstances. It is necessary, they point out, to consider the specific features of Latin America and remember that many of the problems, that were solved long ago in Europe are still on the agenda in Latin America. This is why they regard the introduction of "democratic socialism" as a long-range prospect, and not as an immediate objective.¹¹

Foreign Policy Concepts and Doctrines

The foreign policy concepts of the Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation represent a unique synthesis or symbiosis of social democratic theories with the ideological views that are characteristic of many countries in the so-called Third World. These two elements are intermingled and reflected in their foreign policy programs and in their domestic political activity.

This is most clearly exemplified by the attitudes of these parties toward such cardinal issues as the assessment of the main contradiction of the present era, the direction in which the world balance of power is shifting, the need for peaceful coexistence by states with differing social structures, the causes and significance of international detente, the reorganization of international economic relations,

disarmament, etc. It should be borne in mind that the differences characteristic of Latin American social democrats in interpretations of their ideological views have also been apparent in their approaches to international problems.

The increasing consolidation of Latin American reformist parties on a social democratic basis has caused them to take almost the same approach as the European social democrats and the Socintern to many global problems of the present day.

When the foreign policy strategy of the ruling parties with a social democratic orientation in Latin America (Venezuela prior to 1979, Costa Rica prior to 1978, Jamaica prior to 1981 and the Dominican Republic) was being worked out, their leaders proceeded from the belief that the cardinal changes that had taken place in the world in recent decades had to be taken into account in decisions on international problems.

Setting forth the basic policy aims of his government, one of the leaders of the Democratic Action Party, C. A. Perez, said at a presidential inauguration (1974) that Venezuela would adhere to the principles of peaceful coexistence and was willing to establish equal and mutually beneficial relations with all countries, regardless of their economic and social system.

Similar statements have been made by the leaders of other parties (in Costa Rica and Jamaica). This has also been reflected in a number of major party documents. For example, the platform document of the National Liberation Party (Costa Rica) speaks of adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence by countries with differing social systems.¹²

The move from cold war to international detente, which was made possible by the consistently peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, met with approval in leading social democratic circles in Latin America. Party leaders began to announce their support for detente. Substantiating the National Liberation Party's (Costa Rica) position on this matter, its leader, J. Figueres, said that detente created favorable conditions for the development of small nations, whereas the cold war had made the underdeveloped states even more backward because most of them had adhered to a onesided reliance on the West.

International detente, C. A. Perez said, helps small countries pursue an independent foreign policy. In turn, the small countries can play a positive role in this process along with the great powers and can play a significant part in the reinforcement and materialization of detente and in its extension to the most diverse spheres. "We are definitely in support of the efforts to relax international tension," C. A. Perez said in Moscow in 1976 during the first official visit by a Venezuelan president to the USSR. "The conference in Helsinki was positive proof of a process which must be reinforced constantly and will lead to increasingly constructive decisionmaking."¹³

The social democratic governments of Costa Rica, Venezuela and Jamaica displayed extremely favorable attitudes toward the process of detente; their foreign policy lines were marked by a desire to overcome onesided geopolitical orientation and to establish broader and deeper contacts with the socialist countries.

Most of the parties had a negative reaction to the U.S. administration's foreign policy line of undermining detente, escalating the arms race and instigating confrontations in the international arena. This was reflected in an entire series of documents and statements by party leaders. The cold war exacerbates international tension and stimulates the activity of the most reactionary forces on the continent, said the resolution of the Socintern Committee on Latin America and the Caribbean session (September 1980). The products of cold war, the document notes, are arguments about the so-called "communist threat" that is supposedly hanging over Latin America. These specious pretexts, the resolution stressed, are being used as a cover for efforts to cultivate and consolidate dictatorship in the countries of this continent (1980, No 50, pp 212-213).

The social democratic parties also rejected the Reagan Administration's thesis that the social tension in Central America, in El Salvador for example, is the result of outside intervention, particularly by the USSR and Cuba, in the internal affairs of these states. This scarecrow, party leaders noted, is being waved about by those who oppose social change.

The ideologists and leaders of parties with a social democratic orientation have associated the implementation of principles of peaceful coexistence and the struggle to reinforce and consolidate detente with the proagenda thesis that most of the credit for the establishment and dissemination of these principles should be given to countries where social democratic parties are in power.

This interpretation, which distorts the causes and essence of detente, rests on a fairly widespread belief among the leaders of international social democrats, including the ones in Latin America--the belief that the interests of the "superpowers" conflict with the interests of all other countries. According to this theory, the other countries, including the European states, are suffering from the "political hegemonism" and "economic totalitarianism" of the "superpowers." The theory puts both the United States and the Soviet Union in this category and equates their policies.

The position of many Latin American parties with regard to this matter was clearly expressed by R. Borja, leader of Ecuador's Left Democratic Party. Those who have embarked on the path of "democratic socialism," he said, must take care "not to become a pawn in the political game of the great powers, which are committing aggressive acts against defenseless people in their insane attempts to establish control over the natural resources of the planet" (1980, No 48, p 122).

A similar point of view, but in a more covert form, was expressed in the final resolution of the Caracas Conference, which states that the parties represented at the conference "reject all varieties of imperialism" (1976, No 24, p 68).

Suppositions of this kind lead to the conclusion that the so-called small and medium-sized countries have a collective platform of action regardless of their sociopolitical structure, level of economic development and location.

These concepts serve as an ideological aid for the Socintern leaders who are trying to draw the developing countries, including the Latin American states, into the orbit of their influence, and they serve the leaders of social democratic parties

in this part of the world as theoretical proof of the need to establish closer contacts and ties between the Latin American and Western European countries.

The peculiar position of the countries of this region within the framework of the world capitalist system, however, predetermined, as we mentioned above, the formulation and advancement of certain theories by Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation--theories which reflect the objective needs of these countries to a certain extent and have much in common with similar ideas disseminated in the developing countries of Asia and Africa.

The ideological essence of these concepts testifies that the changes that have taken place in the world have not been interpreted accurately by party ideologists and have been reflected in peculiar ways in their theoretical postulates. In their opinion, these changes mean that the world is no longer a "structure with two centers of gravity."¹⁴ Now the world situation, C. A. Perez said, "depends not only on the United States and Russia, but also on the European Common Market and on communist China."¹⁵

The most significant changes, they maintain, consist in the emergence of a new and important pole of gravity in the multipolar world--the "Third World." In spite of the fact that it "consists of small, weak and developing countries," it has become a serious factor in world politics and can no longer be ignored by the great powers, which set up their own inequitable order, the order of conquerors, as a result of World War II.¹⁶

The most significant event of recent decades, according to the leaders of many parties, was the "Third World" countries' advance to center stage. They are making a decisive contribution to the new alignment of forces in the international arena and the creation of favorable conditions for the struggle of the people of these countries in defense of their national interests.

A distorted assessment of the main conflict of the present day is a logical result of this view of the world. As it is interpreted by the ideologists of social democratic parties, it appears to be a conflict between underdeveloped and industrially developed countries, and not between the two opposing systems--capitalism and socialism. By interpreting the main conflict of the present day in this manner, they are effectively equating the highly developed capitalist countries, which did grow rich exploiting the natural and human resources of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, with the socialist countries, which cannot share any of imperialism's responsibility for the economic underdevelopment of these states. As a result of this, the position of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community with regard to the establishment of the new international economic order (NIEO) is also being presented in a false light.

By assessing world events in this manner, the leaders of many Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation draw what they regard as the perfectly logical conclusion that their countries are "Third World" states. The tendency to view Latin America as an integral part of the "Third World" is most characteristic of the parties of Costa Rica, Jamaica, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and others. For example, C. A. Perez clearly and unequivocally stated that "Venezuela does not merely support the Third World. Venezuela is part of it."¹⁷ It is also

no coincidence that the theoretical organ of the Dominican Revolutionary Party is called the THIRD WORLD (1979, No 41, p 173).

The combination of all this explains why the leaders of these parties made increasingly frequent references to the "Third World" in the late 1960's and early 1970's and ultimately included many theories borrowed from "Third World" ideologists in their own ideological arsenal, especially the concept of the so-called "poor and rich nations."

This concept is something like a perfected and updated form of the theory of "two imperialisms" with which the national reformist parties once armed themselves. It is a well-known fact that the concept of "poor and rich nations" ignores the class approach to the main problems of the present era, equates the capitalist countries with the socialist states by categorizing all of them as "rich nations" and sets them in opposition to all of the developing countries. For example, the leader of the National Liberation Party (Costa Rica), J. Figueres, wrote a work called "La pobreza de las naciones" in which he implies that the main conflict of the present era is the conflict between all of the "rich" nations and all of the "poor" ones.¹⁸

Many party leaders who agree with the concept of "poor and rich nations" try to portray the protection of national interests against encroachment by multinational corporations as a struggle by the "poor" nations against the "rich" ones. This is exactly how the leaders of the Democratic Action Party describe the nationalization of the railways and, in particular, the petroleum industry in Venezuela in 1974-1975. When the decree putting the petroleum industry under state control was being enacted, C. A. Perez presented a speech at the signing ceremony and expressed this point of view: "Oil is an instrument in the hands of the 'Third World' OPEC countries, and they are using it in their relations with the industrial nations to gain the kind of dialogue and understanding that will make the establishment of a new economic order possible."¹⁹

It is precisely the struggle to establish a new international order that represents, according to the ideologists of social democratic parties, one of the main points at which the positions of Latin America and the developing Asian and African countries converge. The struggle for the NIEO has become one of the major areas in the foreign political and foreign economic activity of social democratic governments.

By supporting the concept of "poor and rich nations," the ideologists of Latin American social democratic parties have to admit, indirectly if not directly, that the "rich" states exploiting the countries of the so-called Third World automatically include the Western European states where social democratic parties struggling for the establishment of the NIEO are in power. Therefore, there is an obvious contradiction between this and their other fundamental concept discussed above, namely the conflicting interests of the "superpowers" and all other countries.

Several conclusions can be drawn from an analysis of the role and significance of "Third World" concepts in the theory and practice of some Latin American parties with a social democratic orientation. The interpretation of these concepts is consistent with the aspirations of ruling circles in these states, which have become the most economically developed and financially secure states in this group of countries for a combination of reasons, including huge oil revenues.

There is no question that the demands for a new international economic order reflect the objective needs and interests of the developing countries. Many Latin American social democratic leaders, however, are inclined to make a fetish of the struggle for the reorganization of international relations, portraying it as something just short of a panacea for all of the problems requiring resolution in their countries. This interpretation has a clearly defined ideological purpose. It represents an attempt to separate the artificial struggle for the NIEO from the institution of radical socioeconomic reforms within these countries. In the final analysis, it is supposed to distract the laboring masses, who are aware that the establishment of the NIEO will certainly not guarantee the automatic resolution of all of the cardinal problems of the developing countries, from class struggle and the struggle for their own vital interests.

It is completely obvious that the "Third World" concepts have a practical function to perform in this area. Many theorists from Asian and African countries give these concepts clear ideological overtones and underscore the uniqueness of the "Third World" and the ways in which it differs fundamentally both from the socialist and the capitalist worlds. For the Latin American social democratic parties, on the other hand, the "Third World" concepts and the struggle waged under their aegis are only the means to a quite specific end: Backed up by the collective struggle of the developing states, they will establish a "place in the sun" for their countries within the world capitalist system.

It is certainly no coincidence that the Latin American countries where social democratic parties have been or are in power, with the exception of Jamaica, are not members of the movement for non-alignment. The reason is that party leaders are deliberately confining the activities of their countries within the "Third World" to strictly economic actions. In their opinion, the movement for nonalignment is too political, and the active participation of socialist countries and countries with a socialist orientation in the movement gives it a definite anti-imperialist thrust.

This explains why the leaders of several parties tried to draw distinctions between the Latin American countries and the rest of the "Third World" states by demonstrating that, although they clearly possess some of the characteristics of this group of countries, they are likely to lean toward the West. This is the reason for the attempts to assign the Latin American countries the functions of some kind of connecting link between the "Third World" and the West, particularly Europe. This idea was unequivocally stated by C. A. Perez when he spoke at a meeting of the leaders of socialist, social democratic and related parties in Caracas in May 1976. "Europe should view Latin America," he said, "as a competent middleman, who can serve as a bridge to the Third World" (1976, No 24, p 17).

When we analyze these foreign policy concepts, we must remember that the postulates examined above have not gained the full approval of all of the parties in the ideological current in question. Even here there are differences of interpretation and nuances marking the views of various parties or groups within parties.

Influential forces within Venezuela's Democratic Action Party do not share the beliefs of the party leaders who take a "Third World" stance.

The People's Electoral Movement (Venezuela) has effectively rejected the theory of "superpowers," particularly with regard to the equation of U.S. and Soviet policies. This party's leaders have repeatedly expressed doubts about the willingness of the leaders of European social democratic parties to fight consistently for the establishment of the NIEO.

A similar point of view has been expressed by the People's National Party of Jamaica. Speaking at the conference in Caracas, PNP spokesman D. Thompson delivered a diatribe in which he questioned the sincerity of the Socintern leaders' intentions with regard to Latin America, "because they represent countries which grew rich from the unfair system of international exchange" (1976, No 24, p 20).

D. Thompson made special mention of the fact that one of the main questions--namely the question of who the developing countries' chief enemy is--had been bypassed during the course of debates which were largely abstract ideological discussions. The European social democrats, D. Thompson said, are trying to lead the Latin American representatives away from this problem. Thompson's own answer to this question was the following: Capitalist imperialism, which still dominates the economies of the "Third World" countries, is the chief enemy (1976, No 24, p 20).

The PNP also rejects the concept of the "superpowers," and as far as the socialist countries are concerned, it is highly appreciative of their aid to the developing states, especially the African countries, where people had to fight with weapons in hand for their national and social freedom.

Speaking in Moscow during his official visit in 1979, M. Manley said: "We are fully aware of the epochal significance of the Soviet people's victory in 1917, which not only marked the beginning of the transition from capitalism to socialism but also established a powerful stronghold of support for revolutionary and progressive forces throughout the world."²⁰

Jamaica's increasing convergence with Cuba at the very end of the 1970's attested to the PNP's willingness to rely on Cuba for assistance and support and to use the Cuban experience in socialist construction for the institution of socioeconomic reforms. It is also significant that while the PNP was in power (until 1981), Jamaica was actively involved in the movement for non-alignment and took a consistently anti-imperialist stand on global issues.

An analysis of the fundamental theoretical and political concepts with which the Latin American social democrats have armed themselves indicates that today, now that the confrontation between the two opposing systems is growing more intense, now that world socialism is having more influence in the developing countries and now that many of these countries are openly rejecting the capitalist path of development as one which dooms these people to exploitation and dependence, the ideologists and leaders of the majority of these parties are, with the active support of the Socintern, offering the people of Latin America their own alternative in the form of "democratic socialism." In essence, it presupposes the institution of partial reforms to modernize Latin American capitalism, bring it up to the level of European capitalism and thereby guarantee Latin America's permanent presence within the world capitalist system.

It is also evident, however, that a broad spectrum of various currents and trends can be found under the banner of the social democratic ideology. There are influential forces in many parties whose interpretations of fundamental concepts match leftist socialist interpretations and who are likely to converge with scientific socialism. This indicates that the consolidation of these currents could lead to significant changes in party positions and views.

Latin American Marxist-Leninists are waging a consistent ideological struggle against social reformist theories and concepts. They are doing this with consideration for the fact that the social democratic movement is a heterogeneous one, that leftist currents can wield perceptible influence within the movement and that its mass base consists of potential allies of revolutionary forces. Their strategic line is based on the realization that the prospects of anti-imperialist liberation processes on the continent will depend largely on the degree to which mutual understanding and cooperation can be established between communists and social democrats.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a discussion of the political-organizational ties between Latin American and European parties and of the Socintern's strategy in this part of the world, see: I. V. Danilevich, "The International Social Democrats and Latin America," LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, 1978, No 2; "International Social Democrats and Latin America (Discussion Materials)," LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, 1978, No 4; B. I. Koval' and S. I. Semenov, "Latin America and the International Social Democrats," RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYIY MIR, 1978, No 4; E. S. Dabagyan, "Social Democratic Trends in Latin American Social Reformism," "Problemy sovremennogo rabocheho dvizheniya Latinskoy Ameriki" [The Problems of Today's Workers' Movement in Latin America], Moscow, 1980, pp 115-138.
2. "Socialismo democratico. Postulados basicos," San Jose, 1979, pp 32-33.
3. V. R. Haya de la Torre, "Politica aprista," Lima, 1967, p 99.
4. For example, the Honduran Revolutionary Party actually dissolved itself at the beginning of the 1980's. Supporters of the social democratic alternative in this country are now concentrated in the left wing of the Liberal Party, called the Liberal Popular Alliance.
5. See, for example, A. Baeza Flores, "El socialismo democratico en America Latina," in: "Socialismo democratico. Postulados basicos," pp 29-48; S. Maggi, "El pensamiento Social Democrata en America Latina," ibid., pp 49-60; G. M. Ungo, "Situacion actual y perspectivas de la Socialdemocracia Latinoamericana," ibid., pp 61-67; E. Obregon Valverde, "Por una Socialdemocracia Latinoamericana," San Jose, 1979, pp 9-10.
6. EL UNIVERSAL (Caracas), 2 July 1974.
7. "Ideyno-politicheskiye techeniya imperializma," Moscow, 1976, p 137.
8. D. Boersner, "Que es el socialismo democratico?" Caracas, 1964, p 6.

9. PRAVDA, 11 April 1979.
10. GRANMA, 15 December 1977.
11. R. A. Rojas Jimenez, "Debemos plantear nuestro propio socialismo," in: "Sindicalismo y socialismo democratico," San Jose, 1979, pp 11-16; L. A. Monge, "Evolucion de la idea Social Democrata en America Latina y en Costa Rica," in: "Socialismo democratico en Costa Rica y Venezuela: Los partidos Liberacion Nacional y Accion Democratica," San Jose, 1976, pp 13-28; "Socialismo democratico. Postulados basicos," pp 64-65.
12. "Partido Liberacion Nacional. Carta fundamental," San Jose, 1969, p 32.
13. PRAVDA, 25 November 1976.
14. C. A. Perez, "Venezuela and Peace," Caracas, 1976, p 70.
15. Ibid., p 191.
16. Ibid., pp 70, 191-192.
17. BUSINESS WEEK (N.Y.), 13 October 1975, p 56.
18. J. Figueres, "La pobreza de las naciones," San Jose, 1973, pp 43-77.
19. "La nacionalizacion petrolera," S.L., s.a., pp 7, 16-17.
20. PRAVDA, 11 April 1979.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

SYMPOSIUM HELD ON SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 157-160

[Report by V. Sh. on conference on "Social Democrats and Youth" at the end of 1981, organized by the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR: "A Discussion of the Problems of Social Democrats"]

[Text] A symposium on social democrats and youth was held at the end of 1981 by the USSR KMO [Committee of Youth Organizations]. Its other organizers were the Scientific Council on "The Working Class and Mass Democratic Movements in the Capitalist Countries Under the Conditions of the Present-Day Technological Revolution" and the Institute of the International Workers Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences. The symposium was attended by prominent experts working on these problems in the Institute of Social Sciences, the humanities institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Higher Komsomol School of the Komsomol Central Committee and the Moscow State University Laboratory for the Communist Indoctrination of Youth, as well as officials from the USSR KMO.

In his introductory speech, Deputy Chairman S. A. Ulin of the USSR KMO noted that the analysis of the conference topic is pertinent now that the main segments of the international workers movement have established broader contacts with one another. The CPSU's increasingly strong and extensive business relations with several parties belonging to the Socialist International and with this organization as a whole are noteworthy. The USSR KMO is also contributing to the establishment of regular contacts with social democratic and socialist youth organizations. The USSR KMO's partner organizations include organizations of young socialists in Spain and Austria and social democratic youth leagues in the FRG, Finland and some other Scandinavian countries. Obviously, the speaker said, the group of dialogue partners will also be widened now that interrelations are developing on the highest party level.

The purpose of the symposium, S. A. Ulin said, was not only the elucidation of questions connected with the theme "Social Democrats and Youth," but also a deeper analysis of the domestic and foreign political activities of social democrats and their ideological views. These are being influenced to some degree by the younger generation, which, in turn, is an important object of the practical and ideological work of leading Socintern parties.

The development of CPSU contacts with social democratic parties and organizations was discussed by candidate of historical sciences A. B. Veber. The speaker stressed

that our party has always paid considerable attention to the establishment of good relations with social democrats, regarding this as part of the main problem facing the international workers movement--the problem of overcoming the division of its ranks. By the 1960's the CPSU had already established official relations with Japanese Socialists and Finnish Social Democrats. In the 1970's there were contacts with some of the other Socintern parties. For example, during the interval between the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, interrelations were established with Belgian and French Socialists and the Labor Party in Great Britain. The group of social democratic parties with which business contacts had been established was even larger by the time of the 26th congress. The speaker made special mention of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party, the Norwegian Labor Party and the Danish and Swedish social democratic parties. Contacts with SPD leaders, especially party Chairman W. Brandt, who is also the president of the Socialist International, play an important role. The speaker also mentioned the fall 1979 visit to the USSR by the Socintern task force on disarmament, headed by prominent Finnish Social Democrat K. Sorsa.

Our party leaders' contacts with social democratic leaders have been particularly intensive, and quite productive on the practical level, since the time of the 26th CPSU Congress. These contacts are based on the common concern of communists and realistic thinkers in the social democratic movement about the fate of peace and detente. The issues of disarmament and the need to curb the arms race were the central topics of discussion when General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev of the CPSU Central Committee met with such authoritative social democratic politicians as W. Brandt, O. Palme and M. Foot in 1981. The CPSU Central Committee's contacts with Socintern parties were particularly important in the development of relations between the CPSU and the social democrats. The responses received from these parties testify on the whole to the social democrats' positive reaction to the Soviet communists' deep concern about the deterioration of the international situation.

A. B. Veber said that interparty relations with social democrats are also making a perceptible contribution to the development of intergovernmental cooperation, particularly with the Western countries where social democrats hold strong political positions. This creates important prerequisites for the organization of comprehensive dialogue, furthering the cause of peace, by states with differing social systems. The establishment of contacts between youth organizations, particularly the work conducted by the USSR KMO, is also playing a definite role in organizing this kind of cooperation.

In his report, A. A. Galkin, doctor of historical sciences and department chief at the IMRD [Institute of the International Workers Movement], USSR Academy of Sciences, spoke of the social democrats' participation in the struggle against the danger of war. The speaker noted that this segment of the workers movement wants international detente. After all, during the cold war years the social democrats found themselves in something like a political ghetto after they had to give up their place at the government helm to bourgeois parties. The intensification of the struggle against "all leftists" forced the social democrats to take a defensive position. Besides this, they suffered perceptible social losses. The monopolistic bourgeoisie's demand for "belt-tightening" for the sake of the maximum buildup of Western military strength affected primarily low-income strata, the same strata the social democrats addressed themselves to and relied upon.

Conditions were different during the period of international detente. The general leftward shift in the attitudes of the Western Europeans after they escaped the fetters of cold war gave the social democrats a much stronger position in legislative and executive branches of government. It was no coincidence that social democrats won most of their election victories in the first half of the 1970's. Their actions to promote detente were also dictated by the Western Europeans' stronger desire to conduct a policy less dependent on the U.S. line. In addition to detente, the improvement of relations with the socialist countries objectively created a situation in which centrifugal tendencies grew stronger in Western Europe within the bounds of "Atlanticism."

The speaker stressed that, now that the international situation has been exacerbated by imperialism, it is clear that the social democratic movement wants to preserve detente. The Socintern parties are being influenced by the broad anti-war movement in Europe and by the peaceful foreign policy of the countries of real socialism, with which they actively cooperated at the time when detente was just gathering speed. The social democrats are also being influenced, however, by their close political partnership with parties representing the interests of the particular segments of the Western European bourgeoisie that are inclined to give in to the pressure the new American administration is exerting on Western Europe. The confrontation of these forces determines much of the social democrats' political behavior and is the reason for their inability to exert positive influence on world events.

Candidate of historical sciences V. G. Vasin (IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences) discussed some aspects of the cooperation between communists and social democrats in Western Europe in his report. For the fraternal parties in the West, he said, the social democrats are not only partners, but also ideological and political rivals within the ranks of the workers movement. When communists make specific decisions on contacts and cooperation, therefore, they have to lay special emphasis on one particular element of this dialectical process--the ideological struggle.

According to the speaker, the struggle against reformist ideology is an extremely complex matter. It is important to avoid deviations, whether they take the form of the opportunistic acceptance of social reformism or sectarian rejection of the positive aspects of the activities of various social democratic parties. After all, the working class in the West has made many of its significant advances with the aid of social democrats and the labor unions that are closely associated with them. It is also important to observe another principle of cooperation--equality. This must be observed, regardless of the degree of influence possessed in a country by a particular party.

Of course, the speaker stressed, when communists choose to cooperate with social democrats, they must realize the latter's real motives for consenting to this cooperation. After all, as far as the social democrats are concerned, one of the reasons for this process is the chance of winning communist supporters over to their own side. This can be prevented, however, if the communists maintain the ideological stability of their ranks and uphold the spirit of high political awareness within them. It is obvious that the obstacles encountered in cooperation with social democrats should not limit the Marxist-Leninists' purposeful efforts to organize joint or parallel actions with social democrats. The democratic

alternative to monopoly dictatorship can never be realized without cooperation by the leading segments of the workers movement. Peace in Europe and the rest of the world cannot be guaranteed without this cooperation either. In any case, it is obvious that there will be a greater risk of thermonuclear conflict if the social democrats do not become a permanent element of the resistance movement against imperialism.

Doctor of historical sciences I. M. Krivoguz (Academy of the National Economy of the USSR Council of Ministers) discussed some methodological problems in the study of today's social democrats in his report. According to the speaker, it is important to realize that the social democrats' influence in the workers movement is essentially a reflection of the current level of class awareness in broad strata of the Western laboring public. The laborers' support of the Socintern parties testifies that they are satisfied in general with the way in which social democrats are defending their immediate (but not fundamental) interests.

It is also necessary to clarify another methodological aspect of the study of the social democratic movement--the problem of its crisis. Some researchers view this crisis from a semiabstract vantage point, proceeding only from the assumption that social reformism is a doomed ideology which cannot point out any correct ways of building a socialist society. When the term "crisis" is used in reference to social democrats, however, it must be analyzed primarily from the standpoint of the specific stage of the movement's history, which has its own, quite specific parameters. The crisis of the social democratic movement is a transitional concept, reflecting a situation which took shape in the movement during particular stages in its development.

The first postwar crisis, for example, took place in the late 1940's, when the movement was split both ideologically and organizationally. The crisis was overcome in a unique manner by the creation of the Socintern and by its platform declaration (1951), which summarized the differing views of the parties making it up. The movement suffered its second serious crisis in the middle of the 1960's and in the first half of the 1970's. Its ideological and political aims conflicted with changing domestic and foreign political conditions. This crisis was also localized to some degree with the aid of the Socintern, which set new priorities in the decisions and resolutions of its 13th, 14th and 15th congresses. This also had a significant effect on some of the adjustments made by social democrats in their practical work. Nevertheless, the fact that the movement overcame these crises, the speaker stressed in conclusion, does not provide the social democrats with a panacea for the future. It is obvious that new changes in the process of contemporary societal development will require them to make new adjustments for the purpose of minimizing the gap between social reformism and objective reality.

Candidate of historical sciences B. S. Orlov (INION [Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences], USSR Academy of Sciences) remarked that social reformism had borrowed elements from various currents on the ideological level--utopian and Christian socialism, anarchic syndicalism, classic Marxism and others. Besides this, the "national varieties" of social reformism also reflected the specific historical traditions of their countries. Social democrats did, however, have certain ideological features in common: the renunciation of the negative side of capitalist society, the desire to change this order with the aid of reforms and the conviction that the new society could acquire a new quality--socialism.

An analysis of social democratic ideology according to these three parameters, however, must be based on the realization that various currents in the social democratic movement interpret them in different ways. Whereas the right wing actually favors the "updating of capitalism" and the preservation of its market machinery, the left wing insists on radical reforms which transcend the bounds of present-day capitalist society. On the whole, various currents in the social democratic movement can be differentiated according to the degree of radicalism in their approach to the modification of the societal order. Positions on the extreme left are generally occupied by activists in the youth movement, who reject the stereotypes of the "consumer society" and insist that the goals and objectives of social democrats must have an anticapitalist thrust.

The intensity of the ideological struggle that is constantly going on between various currents of social democrats is reflected primarily in their policy-planning documents. For example, programs adopted by the social democrats in the 1970's indicate heightened activity by the left wing, which was able to make use of the mounting anticapitalist and anti-imperialist feelings within the masses to record a number of this wing's aims in the new long-range documents. It is also indicative that the left wing often makes use of some elements of Marxism in its attempts to renovate "democratic socialism," especially Marx' dialectical method.

A number of speakers analyzed the group of problems connected with the activities of the head social democratic organization--the Socintern. For example, Professor N. G. Sibilev, doctor of historical sciences from the Institute of Social Sciences, discussed the evolution of the Socintern's views on current international events from the 1950's to the beginning of the 1980's. He noted that the Socintern had grown into an authoritative international organization during the postwar period, and largely as a result of its more constructive approach to questions of war and peace.

Candidate of juridical sciences L. Ya. Dadiani (Institute of Sociological Research, USSR Academy of Sciences) pointed out the dual nature of the Socintern's line in the Middle East conflict. On the one hand, this organization is trying to act as a middleman between the countries involved in the conflict, but on the other it is defending Western Europe's interest in uninterrupted oil deliveries. The contradictory policy of the social democrats with regard to the struggle of the people of southern Africa against apartheid was analyzed by post-graduate student V. G. Shubin from the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee. The parties making up the Socintern have not taken any significant steps as yet to oppose the racists and are trying to "pacify" South Africa instead of giving national liberation movements active and all-round support.

Some of the speakers at the symposium discussed the activities of social democrats in the African and Latin American countries. In particular, candidate of historical sciences A. S. Oganova (IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences) spoke of the birth of African parties with ideological links with Western European social democrats. The formation of the African Socialist International, which now unites 10 parties, in 1981 was a sign of the consolidation of African social democrats, who represent the moderate wing in today's national liberation movement on this continent.

The increased activity of social reformist parties in Latin America was discussed by candidate of historical sciences I. V. Danilevich (IMRD, USSR Academy of

Sciences). These parties have been given considerable support by the Socintern. It is quite popular in this region, especially in the Caribbean countries, and largely as a result of its active solidarity with the struggle of opponents of military dictatorships. This solidarity is most clearly reflected in the activities of social democratic youth organizations in such countries as Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and the FRG.

The speeches by KMO officials A. V. Fedorov, Yu. N. Denisenkov, V. Ya. Minchenkov, A. D. Dubina and A. A. Kanunnikov were an important part of the symposium. They discussed the problems now facing social democratic youth organizations in the capitalist countries, the ways in which cooperation is being organized between young communists and social democrats, and the distinctive features of the activities of the leading social democratic youth organization--the International Union of Socialist Youth, a full-fledged member of the Socintern. Contacts between the USSR KMO and social democratic youth organizations in the FRG were analyzed in a report by A. Ye. Gladkov and B. L. Tikhomirov. The young social democrats in this country were the most active supporters of meetings and debates with Soviet youth in the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's.

The gathering listened with great interest to the speech by candidate of historical sciences A. F. Khramtsov (IMRD, USSR Academy of Sciences), in which he analyzed the main reasons for the social democrats' influence with youth. As the speaker pointed out, the social democrats have a certain degree of influence with youth, and in some countries this influence is considerable. Young people make up the majority of the social democrats in the FRG, Austria and Sweden. The main reason is that some of the radical slogans of the social democrats appeal to the younger generation. Another contributing factor is the social democrats' ability to solve some of youth's urgent problems in a more positive way when they are in power than bourgeois parties: They reform the system of higher and secondary education, pay more attention to vocational training and lower the voting age. During periods of severe economic upheavals, however, the social democrats' policy on youth, just as its social policy in general, does not work. As a result of this, certain segments of youth are inclined to sympathize politically with critics of the social democrats on the left and on the right.

The speeches by scholars and practical workers provided a basis for symposium debates on several problems connected with the activities of the social democratic movement. According to Doctor of Philosophical Sciences S. I. Velikovskiy (IMRD), the social democratic movement of each country has certain elements of national political traditions. In particular, the Labor Party, which was nurtured by Fabian socialism, is ideologically quite far from the SPD, which professes a revisionist variety of Marxism. The Scandinavian social democratic parties are marked by elements of Keynesian liberalism, and the French Socialist movement is marked by a combination of anarchic Proudhonism and the traditions of Republican Jacobinism.

Candidate of historical sciences V. Ya. Shveytser (IMRD) pointed out the need for a more differentiated approach to the Socintern parties. The full-fledged members of this international organization now include not only social democratic parties and closely related social reformist organizations, but also populist and nationalist movements and even some movements that are closely related to revolutionary

democratic currents. All of this is reflected in recent Socintern decisions and resolutions, which are somewhat inconsistent with the traditional postulates of "democratic socialism."

Candidate of historical sciences M. V. Kargalova (IMRD) expressed her opinion that the youth protest ideals of the late 1960's no longer have any vital force to speak of in the social democratic movement. Besides this, an analysis of the social democrats' influence with youth must be based on the realization that the behavior and views of young social democrats are not characteristic of all young people. After all, the social democrats in the industrially developed capitalist countries have been unable to win more than one-fifth of all politically active young people over to their side. Many young people view the social democrats as part of the capitalist society's political machinery that they so despise.

The symposium organized by the USSR KMO, just as several other meetings of researchers of the social democratic movement, demonstrated the obvious benefits of forums providing an opportunity to compare views on a matter of scholarly interest and of political significance. The CPSU, as L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at his meeting this February with representatives of the Socintern Advisory Council on Disarmament, intends to continue the consistent implementation of the line approved by the 26th CPSU Congress for dialogue and cooperation with the Socialist International and with the parties making it up, because the CPSU regards them as an extremely influential sociopolitical force (see PRAVDA, 4 February 1982).

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

BOOK ON INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF COMMUNIST PARTIES REVIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 163-166

[Review by I. M. Krivoguz of book "Mezhdunarodnoye yedinstvo kommunistov: istoricheskiy opyt, printsipy, problemy" [The International Unity of Communists: Historical Experience, Principles and Problems] by B. M. Leybzon, Moscow, Politizdat, 1980, 253 pages]

[Text] The pertinence of the issues discussed in this work by renowned Soviet researcher B. M. Leybzon stems primarily from the increasing need to strengthen the international unity of communists in all countries. In addition, it stems from the increased activity of the ideological and political opponents of this unity, particularly the anticommunists who are spreading lies about the "collapse of communism," as well from debates within communist groups.

By analyzing the interconnection of international and national factors in the communist movement, B. M. Leybzon proves in his book that proletarian internationalism is an important part of the scientific outlook of the working class and that it permeates the ideology and policy of its revolutionary vanguard. He writes, with complete justification, that "internationalism is not merely one facet of the revolutionary ideology. It is the focal point of the communist outlook, the touchstone of true revolutionary spirit" (p 24). The author singles out the most important milestones in the development of proletarian internationalism, stemming from the development of the contemporary world revolutionary process and the interaction of its principal stimuli. The author addresses logical criticism to the opponents of the concept of "socialist internationalism"; he argues that "socialist internationalism is not some kind of supreme form of internationalism, but simply the same proletarian internationalism that reflects the specifically fraternal relations and cooperation of the socialist countries" (p 13). He cogently demonstrates the futility of the tendency to substitute the non-class concept of the "new internationalism" for proletarian internationalism. The author describes the productive results of international interaction by revolutionary forces, particularly as exemplified by the struggle of the people of Cuba, Vietnam, Angola and Ethiopia, and states that "proletarian internationalism will retain its vital force until the proletariat has fulfilled its worldwide historic mission" (p 17). B. M. Leybzon underscores the importance of the internationalist indoctrination of all communists.

The author describes the essence and significance of the patriotism of internationalists. He proves that national nihilism is alien to communists; this is

corroborated by descriptions of the communists' selfless defense of the independence and genuine national interests of Italy, Bulgaria, France, other countries in Europe and the Latin American, Asian and African countries. In an analysis of the close connection between the national objectives of individual communist parties and the international goals of the movement as a whole, B. M. Leybzon criticizes various attempts to distort this relationship. In particular, he writes: "We would be guilty of oversimplification if we believed that the national interests and policies of individual communist parties and the international goals of the international communist movement always coincide automatically" (p 33). He examines specific cases in which these elements have not coincided and substantiates the conclusion that "the unavoidable conflicts between national and international factors are not antagonistic" (p 35). The unity of national and international factors, the author correctly points out, lies at the basis of the activities of communist parties and colors their interrelations.

B. M. Leybzon describes the development of forms of communist international unity from the birth of the contemporary communist movement to the present day, singling out several stages in this development.

He accurately pinpoints the distinctive feature of the first of these stages as the desire of communists to establish the Comintern as a single worldwide party based on the voluntary unification of the national parties that were being founded at that time. This desire stemmed from the weakness of the majority of communist parties and from the need to strengthen the communist movement, which was still in the formative stages. He refutes the allegation that the Comintern was a tool of the CPSU and of USSR foreign policy and a means of subordinating all other communist parties to the CPSU. An analysis of interrelations within the Comintern indicates that all of its parties took part in collective, group management and in the resolution of the problems of the revolutionary movement.

B. M. Leybzon believes that the distinctive feature of the second stage was the development of the communist parties' independence. He carefully traces this process back to the beginning of the 1920's. The thorough reinforcement of the communist parties paved the way for a transition from a single international organization to a union of completely independent parties, and the major milestone along the way was the Seventh Comintern Congress (p 63); the process was also a result of the changing objective conditions of communist party activity. The author does not try to conceal the fact that the transition to a union of completely independent communist parties was complicated by the consequences of a cult of personality (p 63).

The need for the further consolidation of communist party independence was one of the reasons for the dissolution of the Comintern. Its dissolution did not mean that communists were renouncing international unity in general; it simply represented the liquidation of an obsolete form of unity that corresponded to a specific period of history.

The author calls the third stage a period during which new forms of international unity were established in the communist movement. He discusses the objective need for this process and the reasons for its complexity and protracted length. He proves conclusively that the creation of information bureaus by some communist

parties was not in any sense an attempt to resurrect the Comintern (p 69). He describes the positive role the information bureaus played in overcoming communist party separation and in mobilizing progressive forces for a struggle for peace. He correctly points out the fact that the report presented by the VKP(b) [All-Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks)] delegation at the information bureau conference in 1949 already mentioned the real possibility of saving the world from a new war (p 71).

The author calls the International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries of 14-16 November 1957 the "initial frontier demonstrating the establishment of new forms of communist unity" (p 76). He discusses the objective preconditions for the reinforcement of the international unity of communist parties, based on independence, equality and non-intervention in one another's affairs, and the efforts that had to be made to achieve unity based on Marxism-Leninism and to frustrate the Maoists' attempts to impose their own "general line" on the communist movement. This stage, which also took in the International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of 1960, was distinguished by the acknowledgment of proletarian internationalism, the development of new forms of communist party interaction and the collective elaboration of the Marxist-Leninist strategy of the revolutionary movement. Analyzing the struggle against Maoism, the author cogently refutes the attempts to explain this simply as a conflict between two parties and exposes the falsity of the accusations with regard to the CPSU's "hegemonism."

The 1960's are examined in the book as a complex period when the unity and independence of parties were threatened and when the new forms of unity "could not be developed without overcoming...several dangerous tendencies" displayed by some communist parties (p 89). This section is particularly interesting because it contains an analysis of the struggle within the communist movement against the schismatic activities of Maoists, against "neutralism," "polycentrism" and the fatalistic acceptance of disagreements, etc. An examination of the objective and subjective causes of this struggle, as well as the first thorough analysis in our literature of the preparations for the 1969 international Conference of Communist and Workers Parties, and an analysis of conference materials from the standpoint of international communist unity give the author an opportunity to cogently describe the ultimate "major victory of internationalism" (p 106). This victory led to the establishment of new forms of international unity and standards of communist party interrelations, based on proletarian internationalism with a view to changing historical conditions.

B. M. Leybzon calls the past decade--the 1970's--a time when the international unity of communists was developed and reinforced primarily by means of regional conferences, although he also points out the considerable significance of other forms of cooperation. Stressing the importance of regional conferences and describing them as a "sign of the diversity" of the unity that holds the international communist movement together (p 114), he resolutely opposes all of the different theories about "regional communism" and subjects them to principled criticism. He reveals the significance of the 1976 Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe as a means of consolidating the unity of the communist movement and proves the futility of attempts to connect this conference with the birth of a so-called "new type of unity" (p 125). "In spite of the degree to

which all of these conferences have differed, they all testified to the communists' increasing need for international solidarity," the author writes, pointing out the uninterrupted development of forms of international communist unity and the invariability of the communist movement's principles (p 130).

A large part of the book is taken up by a discussion of the problems encountered by the international communist movement in the reinforcement of unity at the end of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's.

First of all, the author discusses the significance of the common ideological basis of the unity of communists in all countries, a basis which can be represented only by Marxism-Leninism. Explaining Lenin's idea that revolutionary theory evolves from a combination of revolutionary experience and the revolutionary ideas of all countries, he stresses that "theoretical principles are not affected by temporary changes in conditions" (p 143) and that the revolutionary theory developed collectively by the communist parties reinforces the unity of the communist movement.

Secondly, the author examines the communist attitude toward historical experience and reveals the significance of this experience for communist activity. In this connection, the author reminds the reader of Lenin's idea that the attempt to get rid of "excessively heavy" ideological baggage and "excessively broad" historical experience is a sign of opportunism (p 155). "New developments and new data," he writes, "provide an opportunity to find facets of past experience that were once unnoticed or underestimated" (p 161).

Thirdly, he discusses the independence of each communist party and conclusively proves that independence is not contrary to international unity but is one of its essential conditions. Furthermore, the renunciation of proletarian internationalism is tantamount to a renunciation of ideological and political independence. The equality of communist parties is described by the author as a prerequisite for strong international unity. Although the parties are equal, the position of each party within the movement depends solely on its prestige and on the consistency and firmness of its line, the author says, refuting all of the lies about the "hegemonism" of the CPSU.

Fourthly, the author discusses the place, significance and forms of debate and criticism in the international communist movement, particularly in the collective theoretical work of the communist parties, as well as in bilateral contacts. Although the author underscores the importance of debate, he also notes that debates between persons who think alike presuppose a comradely tone and different behavior than that displayed in fights with anti-Marxists. "If criticism is inconsistent with the accepted standards of the movement, this criticism could have a destructive effect" (p 183). Comradely debates are regarded as a means of strengthening the unity of the international communist movement.

Fifthly, B. M. Leybzon presents a detailed analysis of the important and complex issue of interrelations between communist parties in the socialist and capitalist countries. He proves that the acknowledgment of the defense of socialism as an international duty of communists does not mean that the communist parties in the capitalist countries are "subordinate" to those in the socialist countries. Some of the steps taken in the socialist countries might not coincide with those

taken by communist parties in various capitalist countries, but these contradictions should not be considered inevitable, as they "can easily be eliminated through an exchange of views, the necessary contacts and bilateral meetings" (p 205).

In this book, B. M. Leybzon reveals the increasing significance of internationalism and shows how this has resulted from certain objective processes, such as the internationalization of the economics, politics and culture of all countries and the growing significance of global problems and international goals. Another of the author's observations also pertains to this: "Foreign policy issues are taking an increasingly prominent place in the activities of all communist parties" (p 225). He traces the internationalization of all three prime movers of the world revolutionary process, showing that communists have played the leading role in each case. He discusses the difficulties encountered in the interaction of laborers in the capitalist countries in the struggle against their common enemy. The author stresses the historic responsibility of communists for the development and interaction of the prime movers of the world revolutionary process, which necessitates the further reinforcement of the international unity of the communist movement. This has been made all the more necessary by the concerted efforts of imperialist reaction on the international scale.

B. M. Leybzon's new book, which is based on a broad group of sources and a thorough analysis of theoretical matters, represents a significant contribution to the study of the pressing problems of the contemporary communist movement, to the exposure of anticommunism and to the thorough criticism of various erroneous views.

Some of the statements in the book need explanation and others need clarification. For example, can anyone (as the author does) regard the 1920 addition to the slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" and the 1969 slogan about the solidarity of all progressive forces as an organic part of proletarian internationalism, considering the fact that proletarian internationalism signifies the "unity of like minds" (p 135) right up to the communist reorganization of all society (p 17)? Obviously, the relationship between proletarian internationalism and the international solidarity of all progressive forces needs more thorough investigation. The discussion of the information bureaus' activities seems rather onesided (pp 68-74). The author correctly notes the increased attention given to foreign policy issues by each communist party (p 225), but does not discuss the connection between these issues and national objectives and the international objectives of the movement as a whole. The discussion of the criteria used to assess a party's position in the movement (p 164) probably should have noted that "the more influence a communist party has in its own country, the more significant its contribution can be in the struggle for the common goals of communists in the international arena."* It is probably not "neutralism" that gives rise to nationalist tendencies, as the author writes (p 188), but the reverse. The author does not pay enough attention to the development of cooperation by the communist parties in the countries of the socialist community or

* L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom. Rechi i stat'i" [Following in Lenin's Footsteps. Speeches and Articles], vol 6, p 63.

the considerable progress that has been made in the development of this cooperation. He should have discussed the work of the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA in greater detail. It is not quite clear what era he is calling the "imperialist era" (pp 8, 135, 221) and what he means by "reformism" on page 144. His analysis of some of the events of 1914-1915 contains inaccuracies (p 39), and some of his arguments are not completely convincing (p 45).

These shortcomings, however, do not detract from our overall high assessment of this book. It has been written from the Marxist-Leninist vantage point, possesses the necessary logic, is based on abundant factual material, has a well-defined structure, is written in lucid language and will be of benefit to researchers and to anyone interested in the problems of the world revolutionary process.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

8588

CSO: 1807/129

DIFFERING MEANS OF COLONIAL DOMINATION BY IMPERIALIST STATES

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 3-13

[Article by Gleriy Kuz'mich Shirokov, doctor of economic sciences, deputy director of the Institute of Oriental Studies and expert on the socioeconomic development and national liberation movements of the Asian and African countries: "Problems Connected with the Dependence of the Eastern Countries"]

[Text] Answers to theoretical questions about the future evolution of the newly liberated countries depends largely on the nature, form and degree of their dependence on the centers of world capitalism. Although the phenomenon of the dependence of the developing countries is acknowledged by all authors in Soviet economic literature, there are certain differences of opinion with regard to the meaning of this concept and the evolutionary directions of this dependence. These differences are largely due to the analysis of the term "dependence" as a single and undifferentiated entity; at best, economic dependence is singled out as a particular case. Experience has shown, however, that this dependence is quite clearly subdivided into political (the lack of national sovereignty or limited sovereignty), economic (the dependence of reproduction on the centers of world capitalism) and social (the dependence of social processes on centers of world capitalism) types. It is obvious that these three types of dependence are interrelated, but only indirectly. Each retains some degree of autonomy in its evolution, and this leads to changes in the connections between them.

The dependence of the developing countries is largely the legacy of a colonial past. In view of the fact that the past is still having a tremendous effect on current events in the developing countries, an analysis of the term "dependence" should begin with a historical survey.

Until the era of industrial capitalism, economic dependence was a direct result of the political dependence of the colonial countries. During this stage, extra-economic coercion was the chief method of exploiting the colonies. After liquidating the conquered country's national sovereignty, the mother country (or trading company) pillaged the treasures accumulated by local exploitative classes, assumed the right to collect taxes and instituted compulsory labor to produce (or harvest) the crops desired by the mother country.

The act of pumping out the surplus product by means of extra-economic coercion did not bring about the economic dependence of the enslaved countries. In the first place, these methods of exploitation did not undermine the closed nature of national

reproduction cycles in the colonies or the mother countries. In the second place, during this stage there were no changes in the existing method of production and, consequently, in the nature of reproduction. At the same time, extra-economic coercion laid the foundation for the gradual development of economic dependence. The extortion of the colonies' surplus product, and in some cases even their necessary product, reduced their potential for reproduction. Approaching the simple type in terms of its proportions, it brought about the stagnation of productive forces and, eventually, the invariability of the method of production. Conversely, when the colonies' surplus product entered the mother countries, it increased their accumulations, accelerated the development of their productive forces and thereby contributed to the triumph of the capitalist method of production.

If we consider the possibility of a variety of development in which colonial dependence would be liquidated during the stage of the colonies' exploitation by trade capital, this would not influence the nature of the socioeconomic structure or the reproduction process in the colonies and mother countries.¹ Apparently, however, the types and proportions of reproduction could undergo significant changes.

When trade capital was superseded by industrial capital in the mother countries, the methods of exploiting the colonies changed; extra-economic methods were supplemented more with economic methods. It must be said, however, that the extra-economic methods were retained up to the end of the colonial period. The correlation between these two types of exploitation could vary significantly, however, depending on the colony's level of socioeconomic development, the presence of raw materials desired by the mother country, the developmental level of the infrastructure, etc. Economic methods of exploitation were already predominant by the end of the colonial period in the most highly developed colonies (Ceylon and Malaya), but extra-economic methods prevailed in the least developed (South Yemen).

The very possibility of new methods of exploitation depended on certain changes in the economic structures of the mother countries and the colonies. In the mother countries these changes consisted in a processing industry that developed more quickly than raw material branches and grew more quickly than the domestic market, a higher percentage of skilled workers in the total labor force and, finally, a higher percentage of overseas profits in total accumulations. The colonies, on the other hand, were distinguished by the progressive deterioration of the lowest forms of local industry under the influence of competition from the factory industry of the mother country and the discriminatory colonial system, the increasing concentration of the able-bodied population in raw material branches, the expanded production of vegetable and mineral resources for export and a larger share of surplus product sent overseas.

The process by which colonial and dependent countries were drawn into international division of labor and turned into raw material exporters was not consistently steady. Throughout the entire colonial period the process was simultaneously influenced by factors that drew this group of countries into international division of labor and factors that crowded them out. The opposing factors included technological progress in the economy of the mother country and the exploration of new territories. The development of science and technology virtually nullified the demand for several dozen commodities--salt peter, guano, indigo, bark, quinine and others. The development of new lands in the United States, Canada, Australia, New

Zealand and South Africa by European colonists crowded some foodstuffs from colonial and dependent countries out of the world market. At the same time, technological progress gave birth to the demand for various new commodities from the colonial countries, and the development of transportation ensured their cheap delivery to consumption sites.

Some of the consequences of these contradictory processes deserve special mention. First of all, when labor was informally subordinate to capital, the export production of raw materials or other commodities involved many direct producers (the production of indigo in India, of bark in Ceylon, etc.). The drop in the demand for these goods led to a long period of stagnation of productive forces because the adaptation of small-scale production to the requirements of the world market often took decades. Besides this, if a particular commodity was a country's only export product, the country was excluded from international division of labor for a long time.

Secondly, there was a quicker shift in favor of branches of the first subdivision in the economy of the mother countries in the second half of the 19th century.² This was connected with the transfer of demand from relatively labor-intensive agricultural products to more capital-intensive mineral resources, the production of which could only be mastered with primarily capitalist methods. This resulted in the relative reduction of labor resources involved in export production and made the export sector less dependent on national reproduction as a whole. Finally, the reduced involvement of colonial and dependent countries in international division of labor in the period between world wars apparently signifies that exclusion processes prevailed over the inclusion of new commodities in world trade. To a certain extent, this was due to the modernization of agriculture and a further shift in favor of branches of the first subdivision in the mother countries, as well as the general deceleration of capitalist economic growth rates during the period between the wars.

Therefore, when the economic structure of the "mother country-colony" system was changing, the two elements became more intersupplementary and a single cycle of reproduction began to take shape within this system.³ Neither the mother country nor the colony could accomplish reproduction in its entirety outside this dialectically contradictory system. Without the colonies, the mother countries could not make productive use of working capital, sell all of their finished products or, finally, maintain the uninterrupted regeneration of capital without colonial profits. Without the mother countries, the colonies could not accomplish the sale of the direct producer's necessary product in pre-capitalist structures and make use of fixed capital in a capitalist structure. Complications would also have arisen in the consumption sphere.

The actual nature of the interdependence of mother countries and colonies cannot be determined without a more thorough examination of the peculiarities of colonial exploitation.

In the first place, interdependence came into being while the mother country was still dominating the colonies politically and there was a developmental gap between the two elements of the "mother country-colony" system. Under these conditions, it was less likely that capitalist relations and economic methods of exploitation

would eliminate or replace pre-capitalist relations and extra-economic methods than that capitalist and non-capitalist relations and methods would supplement one another. Furthermore, pre-capitalist methods could acquire a capitalist appearance. In India and Malaya, for example, the estates of large landowners were converted into joint-stock companies and feudal rents acquired the characteristics of dividends.

In the second place, the involvement of the colonial periphery in international division of labor was less a result of the development of productive forces than of the coercive methods of the colonial power structure.⁴ The replacement of natural taxes with monetary ones and the overall rise in taxation rates alone helped to turn use value into a medium of exchange, and this served as a basis for the perceptible growth of market relationships. But the taxes were more than just the means by which the colonial system appropriated the product created by the labor of the direct producer. In many colonies the tax revenues were used to cultivate export crops, clear land for foreign colonists or agricultural companies, provide European entrepreneurs with a guaranteed labor force, etc. In other words, the flow of commodities to the mother country was not the result of the establishment of a new type of productive forces, but of the more intense exploitation of small-scale production, the reproduction of which was still based on traditional structures.

In the third place, the formation of the "mother country-colony" system introduced capitalist exchange--at production prices--into the pre-capitalist economy. But exchange at production prices was inconsistent with the value proportions of exchange in the colonies: Here exchanges were made at prices below national value and part of the direct producer's net product was redistributed in favor of the capitalist entrepreneur.⁵ In view of the fact that the economy of the mother country represented the capitalist method of production within the "mother country-colony" system, the change in value proportions and the redistribution of the product benefited the capitalist entrepreneur in the mother country. This is why the colonies' losses grew as division of labor was perfected within the system.

The economic dependence of the colonial countries during the era of industrial capitalism was reflected in the establishment of a single reproduction cycle within the "mother country-colony" system.⁶ From the standpoint of reproduction, this signified the interdependence of the two parts of the system, and from the economic standpoint it signified the more intense exploitation of the colonies, since their subordinate political status, pre-capitalist and decentralized production system and low level of productivity led to redistribution in favor of the mother country. As a result of participation in the single cycle of reproduction, the proportions of this reproduction, as pointed out above, approached the simple type in the colonies.⁷

Whereas economic subordination was the consequence of political subordination during the stage of exploitation by trade capital, economic dependence acquired a uniquely autonomous nature during the era of industrial capitalism. Industrial capital, which differs from trade capital in its much higher level of concentration and centralization, could force the pre-capitalist countries to accept a system of division of labor and exchange proportions benefiting itself with the use of purely economic methods. Its economic strength was reinforced by the

growing socioeconomic gap between the center and the periphery. This was why the category of dependent states--politically free but economically subordinate to the developed capitalist countries--came into being at the end of the 19th century.

The transfer to economic methods of exploitation and the establishment of economic dependence stimulated another type of dependence--social. Trade capital's methods of exploitation were incapable of changing the economic basis of the enslaved countries. The situation changed when the era of industrial capitalism began.

When the mother country's industrial capital operated in a pre-capitalist environment, it could not independently organize the mass production of raw materials or create permanent channels for the sale of its own finished products. This is why foreign entrepreneurs had to cooperate with local trade and moneylender capital in the majority of Eastern countries, especially the large ones. It was this kind of cooperation or collaboration that nurtured the first shoots of local capitalism.⁸ Under the conditions of capitalism's total domination of the most highly developed parts of the world at that time, the appearance of the embryo of a new order in the colonial world meant that the periphery had to follow the center's lead in the area of socioeconomic development.

The establishment of social dependence, in turn, brought about certain changes in the relations between the two parts of the "mother country-colony" system. Although the development of capitalism in the colonies was a fairly slow process, by the end of the colonial period a relatively strong capitalist structure had taken shape in the majority of Eastern countries. This structure was distinguished by a higher level of production and labor organization and more technical equipment than local small-scale pre-capitalist production. The purchase of raw materials and manpower at prices below cost and the sale of its own items at production prices gave it a higher level of surplus value than in the mother country. At the same time, however, capitalist enterprise in the East had less organic balance than in the mother country. Furthermore, as part of the "mother country-colony" system, it was party to the formation of the average profit norm, as a result of which surplus value was redistributed in favor of capitalists in the mother country.

This was the reason for national capitalism's extremely contradictory position in the colonial economy. On the one hand, after disrupting normal reproduction on the lower levels or simply ruining them, national capitalist enterprise could not absorb the products of their disintegration as it had in Western Europe and North America in the 18th and 19th centuries. This is why the principal aim of development was not the liquidation of traditional structures, but the connection of the direct producer with the means of production on worse terms. At the same time, foreign competition promoted the quicker concentration and centralization of local capital and the more rapid growth of its organic structure than independent development would have caused. As a result, the possibility of establishing the new order in a pre-capitalist structure was sharply restricted, while the basic parameters of the local capitalist structure approached international standards. It was precisely these factors that lay at the basis of the dual nature of the economic structure (the coexistence of capitalist and traditional forms) in the colonial period. On the other hand, structural uniformity (although, of course, with differing stages of development) gave national capital an opportunity to make

use of the advantages of international division of labor. This is why the interdependence within the "mother country-colony" system began to provide local capitalism with certain benefits although it remained disadvantageous for the colonies as a whole. These benefits increased as local capitalism passed through various stages of development and finally made the transition to the factory stage.⁹

The beginning of the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism and the collapse of imperialism's colonial system brought about tremendous changes in the status of the formerly dependent colonial periphery. First of all, political dependence was eradicated. This was an unavoidably long process: When the mother countries offered the colonies political independence, they tried to impose treaties on them that limited their national sovereignty, allowed the mother countries to keep troops or concessions in the colonies, etc. Nevertheless, by the beginning of the 1980's most of the Eastern countries had attained real political sovereignty. This signified the collapse of the dependent "triad" and completely separated economic dependence from social dependence.

Secondly, social dependence underwent significant changes. The establishment of developed socialism as the highest type of socioeconomic order and the formation of the socialist community provided countries possessing the appropriate internal prerequisites with an opportunity to skip the capitalist stage in their transition from pre-capitalism to socialism. In other words, the socially determined inevitability of the transition to capitalism no longer applied to a fairly large group of liberated countries.

Besides this, qualitative changes took place in the parameters of social dependence. Although capitalism was a secondary product in the East, a derivative of Western capitalism, it was not simply carried over to a different socioeconomic environment: When it entered the Eastern countries, it intermingled with the production relations of previous structures, local traditions and customs, thereby acquiring new forms and features. This is why it did not simply repeat the pattern of Western capitalism--a progression from free competition to state-monopoly capital. Here it acquired certain features in its earliest stages which were "a denial of capitalism within capitalism."¹⁰ Under these conditions, the state-monopoly stage was not a historical inevitability even in the countries developing according to the capitalist pattern.

Thirdly, the achievement of political sovereignty excludes the possibility of extra-economic coercion and, consequently, extra-economic methods of exploitation. In view of the fact that economic dependence was partly (and, in the least developed countries, primarily) based on extra-economic coercion and extra-economic methods of exploitation, the eradication of the latter helped to reduce economic dependence.¹¹ This lay at the basis of the developing countries' transfer to expanded reproduction and quicker economic growth after they had won their independence.

The mere acknowledgment of reduced economic dependence is not, however, an adequate description of the developing countries' role in today's world. The reorganization of political relations after the achievement of independence, on the one hand, and the technological revolution with its differing effect on all facets of

societal life on the other have brought about continuous changes in the forms, nature and degree of dependence in the developing countries.

The political liberation of the colonies disintegrated the "mother country-colony" system and replaced the economic dependence of the former colonies on the mother countries with their economic dependence on imperialism as a whole--that is, "individual colonialism" was replaced by collective neocolonialism. Apparently, the transfer to dependence on imperialism as a whole had differing effects on various facets of the developing countries' foreign economic ties.

The production of vegetable and mineral resources was organized primarily to satisfy the needs of the mother country and, in most cases, this country remained the principal importer of traditional resources even after the colonies won their political independence. Furthermore, the monopolies of the former mother country often controlled this production. In an attempt to gain free access to these resources, companies in other capitalist countries began to organize this production in other developing countries, as a result of which the number of suppliers of these resources has increased in the last two decades. This has naturally intensified competition in some raw material markets.

As for imports, the newly independent developing countries have often been able to make use of inter-imperialist conflicts in this sphere in their own interests. In an attempt to penetrate the markets of the former colonies, the monopolies of other imperialist states offer more favorable terms than the monopolies of the former mother country. Besides this, the very possibility of purchasing goods from the socialist countries made noticeable changes in transaction terms in the developing countries' favor. In other words, changes in exports were not as great and not as favorable for the developing countries as changes in imports.¹²

On the whole, the developing countries' share of world commodity turnover decreased constantly throughout the 1950's, 1960's and early 1970's, and their share of exports decreased more quickly than their share of imports.¹³ What is more, the positive balance of trade that was characteristic of the colonies was replaced by a negative balance, and the amount of imports covered by exports decreased constantly in the 1970's (with the exception of the oil-exporting countries).¹⁴ We can draw two main conclusions from all of these changes. First of all, the dependence of the centers of world capitalism on sales markets in the developing countries decreased more slowly than their interest in the acquisition of raw materials. The demand for raw materials shifted to a relatively small group of commodities of a universal or unique nature. This phenomenon has been examined in sufficient detail by Soviet economists and we will therefore simply point out that it stems from the following factors: the modernization and diversification of agriculture in the imperialist countries, which lowered the need for imported vegetable resources, the mass-scale introduction of new processes and synthetic substitutes, which lowered the demand for many types of vegetable and mineral resources; the increasing division of social labor between imperialist countries, which led to the relative reduction of continents with developing countries.

Secondly, reproduction in the developing countries became more dependent on the centers of world capitalism. The eradication of extra-economic methods of exploitation, as pointed out above, creates prerequisites for the unimpeded

organization of traditional reproduction. The "population explosion," however, necessitated a transition to expanded reproduction, even for just the maintenance of existing standards of living. Unfavorable internal socioeconomic and technical-economic factors kept the developing countries from making the move to the new reproduction proportions on their own. This required a rise in the low domestic accumulation norm and the creation of better conditions for the use of capital in production. All of this called for outside resources--financial and material. It was the need for a transition to expanded reproduction that brought about the expansion of imports, financed partially with intergovernmental loans.

The collapse of the "mother country-colony" system also led to another change in the status of the developing countries. The national government's moves to limit imports of goods competing with local products and restrict the flow of foreign capital into the economy as a whole or into individual branches, either in the interest of local entrepreneurs or for fiscal reasons, stimulated the development of the national economy and local business and limited the possibility for exploitation and the choice of economic methods of exploitation.¹⁵ Changes in currency exchange rates, currency parities, customs duties, legislation and other changes in the national interest turned the former colony into an autonomous part, rather than an integral one, of the world capitalist economy.

This autonomy sharply restricted or even completely eliminated another instrument used for the foreign exploitation of the former colonies. The rise in customs duties and the institution of non-tariff barriers raised the price of import goods in the domestic market of the liberated country. As a result, the pricing system in the domestic market was isolated from the world capitalist market. There were two consequences of this process. From the foreign economic standpoint, the system of customs tariffs allowed the state to completely or partially (depending on conditions in the world market) regain the value that had previously been redistributed out of the national economy into the world capitalist economy. The more consistent and comprehensive these measures became, the more beneficial foreign economic ties were for the national economy as a whole. From the domestic economic standpoint, this autonomy changed the patterns of redistribution. Whereas value was redistributed from pre-capitalist structures to capitalist ones during the colonial era, now redistribution benefited all producers whose prices were influenced by the government's customs measures. This has accelerated the modification of the economy's sectorial structure.

Further changes in relations with imperialism resulted from the accelerated development of capitalism in the East in the 1960's and 1970's. The increasing proportional size of the capitalist sector, which had the same structural means of production, methods of organization and management and so forth as the sector in the capitalist countries expanded the part of the economy which could or did make use of the advantages of international division of labor. For the national economies of the newly liberated countries, however, the particular form taken by capitalism was of extreme importance.

In the Eastern countries with a capitalist orientation, the establishment of capitalist relations is promoted by three main agents: national private capital, foreign monopolies and the local government. Relationships between individual

agents and the nature of their interaction can differ widely depending on historical traditions, the developmental levels of the economy and socioeconomic relations, the degree of involvement in the world capitalist economy, etc. From this standpoint, the Eastern countries can be divided into several groups.

The first group consists of countries that are extremely backward in the socioeconomic sense. Local private capital in these countries is extremely weak. Here the main agents of capitalist development are the capitalist state structure and the foreign monopolies which serve as its partners or contractors. These countries include Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and others. The second group consists of countries where local capital is fairly strong (Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong and others). Here the state plays primarily a regulating or stimulating role and the main agents of capitalist development are the national and foreign groups of private capital, which often cooperate closely with one another. Finally, in such countries as India, Turkey and others, the government structure and national private capital are both fairly strong. In these countries it is more convenient for foreign monopolies to cooperate with local private capital.

Foreign or mixed (with foreign capital holding the controlling interest) companies generally belong to large enterprises with modern technical equipment and production methods. These enterprises can purchase local manpower at prices below cost, acquire raw materials on terms guaranteeing the appropriation of rent differentials, etc. These are the factors that allow foreign monopolies to earn profits exceeding the profit level in their own countries. The very conditions of operations in a highly monopolized market and the possibility of using the mechanism of transfer prices, of interacting with branches in other countries and so forth allow foreign monopolies to keep most of their profits. Their high profit margin indicates that the main benefits of participation in international division of labor are derived by foreign monopolies rather than by developing countries.

In most of the Eastern countries the enterprises controlled by national private capital operate for the domestic market more than foreign or mixed companies. This is largely due to their chances of acquiring government support in the form of customs protection, preferential credit terms, government orders, etc. These same factors, however, are the reason for their relatively low level of production organization and technical equipment. Under these conditions, the entry of these enterprises into the foreign market is connected with the overt or covert redistribution of value produced in the traditional sector. In other words, the advantages derived by local private capital from participation in international division of labor are directly connected with the deterioration of reproduction conditions in the traditional sector and can therefore be a disadvantage in many cases for the economy as a whole.

As for the capitalist state structure, it serves the interest of the dominant class (or classes) and, to some degree, the national interest in the Eastern countries. Its services include protection against foreign competition, the creation of absent reproduction links, the augmentation of labor productivity, particularly on the lower levels, economic integration, etc. In most of the Eastern countries the state sector also concentrates primarily on satisfying the needs of the domestic market.¹⁶ When the state sector enters the world market (regardless of whether it does this with the products of its own enterprises or with items from

the lowest levels of production), its operations can benefit not only the local bourgeoisie but also the entire economy. In the world market the state sector acts as a large concentrated production unit. A large share of the income it earns from foreign economic transactions is used for economic development. Therefore, the advantages of participation in international division of labor are socially determined; broader state enterprise is in the national interest and promotes more advantageous foreign economic contacts for the developing countries.

The cyclical and structural crises of the 1970's brought about additional changes in the Eastern countries' interrelations with the imperialist states. In view of the fact that these matters have been analyzed in many publications, we will discuss just one aspect here--the increased differentiation of developing countries during the course of these crises.

For the overwhelming majority of Eastern countries, the crises lowered the demand for raw materials and heightened the instability of their prices. The economic status of the developing countries was affected negatively by stricter limits on the access of items from their processing industries to the markets of developed capitalist states, the higher price of credit in connection with the reduction of intergovernmental aid, etc. They remained just as dependent, or even more so, on financial support from imperialism.¹⁷ Furthermore, in view of the fact that many countries have exhausted all possibilities for further development on the basis of extensive methods (as a result of the "population explosion," the fuller use of easily accessible natural resources, etc.), a transfer to intensive methods of production is necessary. The possibilities of this kind of transfer depend on imports of modern technical equipment, the recruitment of manpower with the necessary skills, organizational experience and so forth. In view of the fact that the developing countries obtain most of these material and non-material production factors from the centers of world capitalism, the latter's control during the transition from extensive to intensive methods of production causes the dependence of the Eastern countries to take a new form, which has been termed technological dependence. As a result of all this, imperialism retains its ability to continue exploiting these countries, although the degree and scales of this exploitation decrease during the course of independent development.

The other extreme is represented by a small group of countries with universal or unique types of raw materials, especially petroleum. The fact that petroleum is irreplaceable as a source of energy and a chemical raw material allowed the OPEC countries to raise the price of oil dramatically (approximately 5-fold in real terms) and accomplished fundamental changes in the system of relations with international oil monopolies. Imperialism's inability to bring about a return to old forms and degrees of exploitation by means of force has changed the balance of transactions between the oil-exporting countries and imperialism in their favor: In the second half of the 1970's they were appropriating over 3 percent of the gross domestic product of the developed capitalist countries.¹⁸ As a result, economic relations with imperialism became more advantageous.

In other words, for these countries, which occupy a unique position, imperialist exploitation has formally ceased; furthermore, the redistribution of the net product of imperialist states in favor of the oil-exporting countries seems to

attest to the budding dependence of the developed capitalist states on this group of developing countries. However, considering the extremely backward socioeconomic relations in the overwhelming majority of oil-exporting countries, their inability to accomplish expanded reproduction on the basis of internal material and non-material factors, the dependence of their ruling classes on outside support and, finally, the possibility of making profitable use of their income only within the framework of the world capitalist economy, it would appear that they are still dependent on imperialism.

The quantitative measurement of the correlation between these two types of dependence does not seem possible as yet. Apparently, it can differ considerably in each specific case--this will depend on the objectives of socioeconomic policy, methods of economic development, the nature of relations with imperialism and so forth.

Therefore, when developing countries win political independence, fairly significant changes take place in their interrelations with imperialism. Although the overwhelming majority of these countries still represent the dependent and exploited periphery of the world capitalist economy, the degree of this exploitation has decreased in several cases and forms of exploitation have undergone changes. It is probably incorrect to use the term "dependent and exploited periphery" in reference to the entire community of developing countries in analyses of the current situation. In the first place, the establishment of the socialist community and the birth of a more progressive socioeconomic order nullified the inevitability of the capitalist development of all liberated countries. This is clearly attested to by the experience of countries with a socialist orientation. In the second place, even the countries which are developing according to the capitalist pattern but are in a more favorable economic position now have an opportunity to derive advantages from their interrelations with imperialism. It is obvious that the actual degree of advantage will depend on many factors, both internal and external. The phenomenon itself, however, testifies to the exacerbation of the crisis of capitalism as a social structure.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 23, p 247; Vol 25, pt II, p 360.
2. See, for example, V. Zombart, "Sovremennyy kapitalizm" [Present-Day Capitalism], Vol 3, pt 1, Moscow, 1929, p 128.
3. See N. A. Simoniya, "Strany Vostoka: puti razvitiya" [The Eastern Countries: Patterns of Development], Moscow, 1975, pp 161-164.
4. The colony was first involved in the division of social labor with the mother country and then involved in international division of labor only through the mother country. This mediated form of involvement in internal economic ties was enough to inhibit changes in the structure of the colonial economy (see V. V. Vasil'yev, "International Division of Labor in the Colonial Era," NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, 1981, No 2, p 57.

5. For more detail, see "Tovarno-denezhnyye otnosheniya v ekonomike Indii" [Commodity and Money Relations in the Indian Economy], Moscow, 1976, pp 54-55.
6. It was usually not the entire economy of the colony that was involved in the single reproduction cycle, but primarily the export sector, which had the characteristics of an enclave in many colonies.
7. Studies of economic history indicate that the economic growth rates in the Asian countries in the first half of the 20th century were slightly higher than the rate of natural population growth--that is, in terms of proportions, per capita reproduction remained close to the simple level (V. Sheynis, "The Developing Countries: Peculiarities of Postwar Economic Growth," MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, 1981, No 12, p 55).
8. See, for example, V. I. Pavlov, "Formirovaniye indiyaskoy burzhuazii" [The Development of the Indian Bourgeoisie], Moscow, 1958, p 150.
9. The increasing strength of the national bourgeoisie as a result of participation in international division of labor was one of the main factors exacerbating its conflicts with imperialism. The local bourgeoisie wanted to put an end to the extra-economic methods of imperialist exploitation that were inhibiting its own activities in the domestic market and tried to stop the redistribution of profits in favor of the mother country, which was still going on even at this stage.
10. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit., Vol 25, pt I, pp 478-485; Vol 46, pt II, p 155.
11. V. Rymalov and V. Tyagunenko, "Slaborazvityye strany v mirovom kapitalisticheskom khozyaystve" [The Underdeveloped Countries in the World Capitalist Economy], Moscow, p 19; "The Future of the World Economy," Report by a Group of UN Experts Headed by W. Leontief, Moscow, 1979, App VI.
12. It is indicative that the program for the new international economic order proposed by the developing countries calls primarily for the improvement of exports rather than imports.
13. If we exclude the oil-exporting countries, we can say that this is still going on.
14. I. S. D'yakova, "Vneshnyaya trgovlya razvivayushchikhsya stran Azii" [The Foreign Trade of the Developing Asian Countries], Moscow, 1978, p 8.
15. "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: zakonomernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy" [The Developing Countries: Trends, Tendencies and Prospects], Moscow, 1974, p 167.
16. "World Industry Since 1960; Progress and Prospects," New York, 1979, p 323.

17. "World Development Report 1980," Washington, 1980, p 10.

18. Ibid., pp 11, 134-135.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury,
1982

8588

CSO: 1807/131

GOVERNMENTAL FORMS OF SOCIALIST-ORIENTATION AFRICAN STATES

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 13-23

[Article by Yevgeniy Nikolayevich Mel'nikov, candidate of juridical sciences and expert on African politics and governmental-legal affairs: "The Development of the Machinery of State in the African Countries with a Socialist Orientation"*]

[Text] The formation and consolidation of a new form of government represent one of the important features of the political development of countries with a socialist orientation. Before it can be formed, however, the old colonial structure must be eradicated in countries which choose a socialist orientation immediately after they have won their independence (Guinea and Algeria) or the neocolonial structure must be dismantled in countries which first developed according to the capitalist pattern and then choose a socialist orientation (the Congo, Madagascar and Benin).

Karl Marx' famous remark that the dismantling of the old "military bureaucratic machine" is a preliminary condition for "any effective people's revolution"¹ and Lenin's statement that "the act of smashing this machine and dismantling it is truly in the interest of the 'people,' the majority of the population, workers and most peasants"² could apply, in our opinion, to the national democratic revolutions in these countries which result in the choice of a socialist orientation.

Of course, these Marxist-Leninist statements and the experience of state construction in the socialist countries cannot be mechanically applied to the conditions of African countries because the revolutions in Africa are national democratic, and not socialist; in many cases, their leadership includes, along with true revolutionaries, forces impeding the further development of the revolution, including forces objecting to the dismantling of the old government structure. It would be wrong, however, to not take these statements by the founders of Marxism-Leninism into account in an analysis of the present situation. Past events have shown that many leaders of countries with a socialist orientation are well aware of this.

The need to dismantle the old machinery of state is mentioned as an immediate political objective in various party documents and policy statements by national leaders and statesmen in the countries with a socialist orientation. For example,

* As exemplified by the former French colonies.

the program adopted by the Congolese Labor Party at its second special congress in 1972 said that "today's administrative machinery, which was inherited from colonialism and is a system of neocolonial domination, must be destroyed and replaced with a new administration--a revolutionary, democratic and popular one."³ The chairman of the Central Committee of the Benin People's Revolutionary Party and the president of Benin, M. Kerekou, stressed: "To create a new state, we must take possession of the old one, resolutely dismantle it and gradually build a new state to take its place."⁴

The process of dismantling the old state structure and forming the new one is still going on, but it has been accompanied by serious difficulties. The greatest obstacles are the presence of archaic political and social structures left over from the past (the institution of tribal chiefs, tribal traditions and so forth) and the traditionally special role of the bureaucracy in the newly liberated countries. Experience has shown that this process takes a fairly long period of time in the countries with a socialist orientation and requires the political vanguard to display considerable flexibility and make realistic assessments of the complex conditions and specific features of each individual country. Difficulties in the creation of a new machinery of state also stem from the fact that the leaders of these countries have no experience in state construction. It is also significant that the development of a new state structure in these countries is constantly impeded and complicated by internal reactionary forces and by neocolonialism. The latter still has considerable influence in the economies of these countries and can influence their domestic political situation.

Whereas the system of top-level state organs--the institution of supreme revolutionary councils, the president and the government--was created within a relatively short period of time, the formation of the machinery of state in the more narrow sense, the group of various executive and administrative organs responsible for the daily management of the state, has usually been more difficult to accomplish. In the former French colonies, in particular, the four French administrative offices or ministries which functioned during the period of capitalist orientation had to be replaced with an entire group of absolutely new establishments in charge of planning, education, social development, public health and so forth and, what is most important, had to be staffed with personnel capable of working toward socialist objectives.

The new regime takes the necessary measures to overcome difficulties. It strives to establish new principles of government organization and activity: the management of the government structure by the ruling revolutionary democratic parties; democratic centralism; governmental unity; power vested in the people; the principles of criticism and self-criticism; the principles of equal rights for citizens, etc.

The supreme or national revolutionary councils (or committees) are fundamentally new organs of state authority in the countries with a socialist orientation. They constitute the highest legislative, executive and, sometimes, even judicial authority. These organs are created during the most difficult initial stages of the development of countries with a socialist orientation. They have functioned in all of these countries for some time, and in a few of them, such as Madagascar for example, this kind of organ is still functioning.

Organs of this kind exercise the most concentrated and centralized governmental power. For example, in accordance with Algerian Ordinance No 65-182 of 10 July 1965, the Revolutionary Council was given "the authority necessary for the functioning of government bodies and the life of the nation."⁵ The Supreme Revolutionary Council in Madagascar is called the "guarantor of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution" in the 1975 Constitution. What does this actually mean? Decisions on major aspects of national life are made at meetings of the Supreme Revolutionary Council: A program is mapped out for the fulfillment of the Charter of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution, general instructions are given to the administration, the principles of national defense are worked out, decisions are made to convene or dismiss sessions of the National People's Assembly and on parliamentary elections, directives are issued on financial matters (in the event that the appropriate law is not adopted in the parliament within a specified period of time), on a state of emergency and on referendums, etc.

The considerable concentration and centralization of authority can also be seen in the extensive powers granted to the council chairman, who is generally the highest official in the government and in the ruling party, and is often the head of the administration as well, as was the case in Algeria and is now the case in Madagascar. Sometimes he also heads the most important ministry or group of ministries (defense, internal affairs, foreign affairs and so forth). Other members of revolutionary councils are also endowed with extensive powers.

The creation of supreme revolutionary councils is dictated by the need to concentrate authority in order to guarantee the retention of revolutionary gains, prevent a counterrevolutionary coup or quickly put an end to outside aggression. As a rule, most of the members of supreme revolutionary councils are military officials. Past events have shown, however, that the functions of these councils are transferred to civilian institutions--the president, the administration or the parliament--as the new regime undergoes stabilization. Civilians usually constitute the majority in these organs of authority and administration. For example, military men constitute only 6.5 percent of the deputies in the Congolese parliament elected 8 July 1979, and 11.5 percent in the Benin parliament elected 20 November 1979.

The revolutionary councils are transitional organs of state authority by their very nature. But they are not always dissolved immediately after elective organs of authority and administration are created. In Algeria the revolutionary council did not cease to exist until 1979, after the new regime had become firmly established in national life and after the elections of a president (in 1976) and a parliament (in 1977). In Madagascar, on the other hand, the Supreme Revolutionary Council is still in existence, despite the presence of a president, administration and parliament, and its chairman is also the president of the country.

The supreme revolutionary councils determine the methods, rates and sequence of projected political state reforms with a view to the specific conditions in a particular country. In some countries reconstruction begins on the highest levels of authority. In others, such as Algeria for example, this process begins from the bottom, with elections of the appropriate representative bodies in communes and wilayates. This was followed by the election of a president and parliament and the dissolution of the revolutionary council.

The institution of the national presidency plays an extremely important role in the system of top state organs, particularly after the supreme revolutionary council has performed its functions. The president heads the entire central administration and is the chief executive. In countries with a socialist orientation the ruling party nominates candidates for the presidency. The candidate is usually the head of the party and the leader of the revolutionary democratic movement. In the People's Republic of the Congo, for example, the central committee chairman elected at a congress of the ruling Congolese Labor Party automatically becomes the president of the country. The republic constitution (Art 6) says that "the chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labor Party is elected to the office of president of the republic...by a congress of the Congolese Labor Party"; he is endowed with "the power of the president of the republic, the head of state and the chairman of the council of ministers by the national people's assembly." The secretary general of the Democratic Party of Guinea holds the special title of supreme ruler and, in this capacity, according to the charter of the Party-State of Guinea of 1979 (part of which is the national constitution), "is the only party-state candidate for the highest elective office in the republic"--that is, the office of president. The president is elected by means of a nationwide ballot and is sworn in by the National Party Congress.

The presidential election procedure and the length of the president's term differ. For example, in Guinea and Madagascar the president is elected by means of a nationwide ballot for a term of 7 years. In Algeria the procedure is the same but the term is 6 years. In the Congo the central committee chairman elected at a ruling party congress automatically becomes the president for 5 years. In Benin the president is elected by the national assembly for a term of 3 years at the suggestion of the Central Committee of the Benin People's Revolutionary Party. In some countries there is a fairly high minimum age requirement for presidential candidates: 35 in Guinea and Madagascar and 40 in Algeria. There is no minimum age requirement in Benin and the Congo, but the men who are elected are of this age: President M. Kerekou of Benin was 47 when he was elected and President D. Sassou-Nguesso of the Congo was 36.

Presidents are endowed with varying degrees of authority in different countries, but their powers are extensive on the whole. In Madagascar the president heads the revolutionary council. As a rule, the president is the head of the administration. Quite often, presidents (just as chairmen of revolutionary councils--see above) take on the functions of heads of major ministries.

Particularly extensive powers are envisaged for the president expressly in the event of complications arising from various types of domestic events or outside intervention, as was the case, for example, in Benin in 1977, when a group of foreign mercenaries attempted a coup d'etat. At times like this, the president usually declares a state of emergency, siege or martial law and is given emergency powers. To keep the president from exceeding his authority, this is generally accomplished with the consent of the council of ministers, the chairman of the parliament, the leading organ of the ruling party or all of these institutions together. Sometimes this also requires the preliminary consent of the supreme constitutional court. According to the 1979 constitution of the Congo (Art 70), "under certain circumstances and with the approval of the Central Committee, the

president of the republic can issue a decree, adopted at a session of the council of ministers, to declare a state of emergency or siege in the country, which endows him with emergency powers under conditions envisaged by law." According to the 1976 Algerian constitution, "in cases of urgent necessity," the president of the republic declares a state of emergency or siege after convening the government and leading party organs and takes all of the necessary steps to normalize the situation. The ordinances and directives issued by the president at this time do not require parliamentary approval. At other times, when there are no difficulties, the president can issue various decrees without the consent of the parliament primarily on financial matters, usually the budget, and these ordinances or directives will have the force of law.

Although the presidents in the countries with a socialist orientation have quite extensive powers, they do not have the kind of exceptional executive prerogatives assigned to presidents in the majority of capitalist countries, particularly those in which the established regime is authoritarian or displays authoritarian tendencies. In countries with a socialist orientation, on the contrary, there is an obvious desire for collective action. This is attested to, in particular, by several provisions in the constitutions of these countries. For example, according to the 1975 constitution of Madagascar, the president of the republic "assists" the supreme revolutionary council and administration. According to the 1977 constitution of Benin, on the other hand, the president of the country ratifies or denounces treaties with foreign states and appoints or replaces national defense committee members only "with the authorization of the national revolutionary assembly or its standing committee." Similarly, it is on the basis of the decisions of parliament or its standing committee that the president of Benin "decrees amnesty and declares a state of emergency, martial law, universal or partial mobilization and siege." The president appoints or dismisses members of the government and its standing committee only at the request of the Central Committee of the Benin People's Revolutionary Party and with the authorization of the national revolutionary assembly (Arts 54-57).

To a certain extent, the tendency toward collective leadership is also attested to by the retention of the office of prime minister in several countries (Guinea, Algeria, the Congo and Madagascar). There is, however, a "presidential administration" in these countries because the prime minister is not actually the head of the government, but only a so-called administrative premier--the first among equal ministers. The functions of the head of the administration are performed by the president of the country, and the administration is only a kind of auxiliary presidential organ. For example, the charter of the Party-State of Guinea of 1979 says that governmental power is exercised by the president "with the aid of the cabinet of ministers" (Art 238). The government's assistance of the president is also mentioned in the constitution of Madagascar. In most of the countries with a socialist orientation the prime ministers and ministers are accountable not to the parliament, but directly to the president (Guinea, Algeria and Madagascar). In the Congo, however, only the prime minister is accountable to the president, and ministers are accountable to the prime minister.

The tendency toward collective leadership can be traced, in our opinion, in the experiences of the Congo. According to the 1970 constitution, the president was the head of state and the head of the state council--one of the highest organs of

state authority. When the next constitution was adopted in 1973, it established a council of ministers, headed by a prime minister who oversaw the activities of subordinate ministers. The 1977 council dissolved the state council but established a military committee which existed until 1979. When the military committee was dissolved, decisions on important matters began to be made by the president, but only with the approval of the party central committee.

The second most important institution after the president is the administration. It is given different names in different countries: In Algeria, the Congo and Madagascar is the council of ministers, in Benin it is the national executive council and in Guinea is the cabinet of ministers. All of them have the same purpose--they are operational executive, directive organs.

The administration consists of a chairman (usually the president of the country), his deputies, a prime minister if one is specified in the constitution, his deputies, ministers of state, ministers and secretaries of state. Conventionally, the ministers of state, ministers and secretaries of state are subordinate to the deputy or deputies of the prime ministers, and the prime minister is subordinate to the president as the chairman of the administration. Only in Guinea was a different hierarchy instituted in 1972. First the office of prime minister was established, and then some ministers were assigned the authority of so-called coordinating ministers, responsible for the supervision of groups of ministers. In all, there were seven such groups, five of which were headed by coordinating ministers. The prime minister coordinated the work of the ministries of the people's army, foreign affairs and financial control. The president oversaw the work of the Ministry of Information and Ideology.

Sometimes a so-called cabinet is a special part of the council of ministers. Its members are usually the prime minister, his deputies and a few ministers in positions of the greatest responsibility. In Guinea, for example, when the coordinating ministries were in existence (from 1972 to 1979), the prime minister and the coordinating ministers were members of the cabinet.

The administration is generally formed by the president of the country, but sometimes only after consultations with other administrative bodies (for example, the Supreme Revolutionary Council in Madagascar and the central committee of the ruling party in the Congo).

Normative acts on the organizational structure of the administration have been promulgated in all of the countries with a socialist orientation. Special decrees are periodically issued on the distribution of functions among ministers. These decrees stipulate the number of deputies of the prime minister, ministers of state, ministers and secretaries of state and indicate the sector overseen by each member of the administration. In the majority of countries a member of the administration cannot serve as a deputy.

When the administration is accountable to the parliament, as is the case in Benin, for example, the parliament generally uses conventional methods to oversee administration actions: the discussion of the program of a new administration by the parliament; the delivery of regular reports to the parliament; the delivery of

various requests and appeals to deputies. Members of the administration can be invited to sessions of parliament and its committees for informational or explanatory purposes. The right to put a question to a vote of confidence is granted to the administration, however, and not the parliament. In Madagascar, for example, if the administration and parliament should disagree on the administration's general program of action, "the prime minister can ask the administration for a vote of confidence." It must be said, however, that there have never been any cases in which the administration has resigned as a result of a vote of no confidence.

In general, the powers of the administration in these countries are essentially limited. It is still only an auxiliary body, or even an advisory body of the president, who heads the executive branch. In some countries there have been no prime ministers at all for long periods of time, and the administration has been headed by the president. In Guinea, for example, the institution of the prime minister came into being in 1972--that is, 14 years after the declaration of independence. The Congo did not have a prime minister until 1971 and Algeria established this office only in 1979. In Benin the constitution still does not envisage the office of prime minister. Even though the majority of countries have a prime minister, the government is still "presidential."

The authority of the administration and its interrelations with other top-level organs of authority and control are also influenced by the role played in the country by the ruling revolutionary party. These parties often exercise control through their organs.

Nevertheless, the matters under the administration's jurisdiction constitute a broad and diverse group. According to the 1979 constitution of the Congo, for example, they include the following:

Supervision of the execution of political, economic, cultural, scientific and social acts, as well as acts on defense adopted by the National People's Assembly;

The proposal of draft general plans for the economic and social development of the country and, after their ratification by the National People's Assembly, the supervision of their fulfillment;

The supervision of republic foreign policy and relations with foreign governments; the signing of international treaties and the submission of these treaties for ratification;

The supervision and control of domestic and foreign trade;

The preparation of a draft state budget and the supervision of its execution;

The safeguarding of national defense, the maintenance of law and order in the country and the protection of civil rights; the execution of laws and treaties; the fulfillment of party directives regarding the overall organization of the revolutionary armed forces;

The creation of the necessary committees, the appointment of individuals to various civilian and military positions and the dismissal of officials who have committed offenses;

The execution of the orders of the National People's Assembly;

The adoption of the necessary measures to organize referendums called by the Central Committee of the Congolese Labor Party.

Administrations are endowed with so-called regulating authority for the performance of these functions: They can publish various statutes, orders and other normative acts to enforce certain laws, ordinances and decrees passed by the legislative branch.

In recent years the number of ministries in the countries with a socialist orientation has increased perceptibly. There are ministries of planning and state control, ministries in charge of state property, ministries of education, culture, public health, social affairs, sports and so forth. But even traditional ministries, such as ministries of internal affairs, have acquired absolutely new functions in the countries with a socialist orientation (struggle against counterrevolution, corruption and tribalism). Each ministry in the countries with a socialist orientation takes on new functions; in essence, the purpose of these functions is to solve problems connected with the institution of reforms aimed at the creation of the prerequisites for the society's progression toward socialism.

Organs to protect the state structure and the social order--the army, police (or militia) and the courts--are an integral part of the government in any country. These organs are also undergoing changes in the countries with a socialist orientation: new ones are taking the place of old ones; it is their job to combat forces opposing the establishment of the new socioeconomic order.

The armies in the countries with a socialist orientation perform three main functions: They protect the state against outside aggression, suppress counterrevolution and participate in the construction of the new socialist society. "The chief mission of the people's army today," M. Kerekou said, "consists primarily in defending the authority of the revolutionary state in every way possible."⁶ Article 99 of the 1979 constitution of the Congo says: "The National People's Army is participating in the economic, cultural and social development of the country for the purpose of building a socialist society."

The army of Guinea, for example, repulsed Portuguese aggression in 1967, 1970 and 1973. In 1977 the Beninese Army expelled foreign mercenaries who had landed in Cotonou with the aim of organizing a coup d'etat. In 1970 the army of the Congo suppressed an uprising by conspirators headed by Lieutenant Kinganga. In 1973 it liquidated a detachment of rebels headed Diawara. In the same year the Guinea Army maintained order in the country during the monetary reform and stopped several attempts by speculative elements to provoke disorder.

Armies in different countries have developed according to different patterns. The army of Algeria, for example, was borne during a stubborn 7-year struggle against a powerful French Army of 800,000 men armed with the latest weapons. Others, such

as the armies of Guinea, the Congo, Madagascar and Benin, came into being when the national democratic order was being established or soon after revolutionary democrats took power. They were created either on the basis of some former military units or were essentially created anew, with people devoted to the revolution, on a new social class basis and were reorganized in accordance with new objectives.

In several countries the armies take an active part in urgent and particularly important economic tasks--soldiers help peasants during the harvest season or aid in the rapid completion of necessary projects. An army must be mobile, strictly centralized and under the general supervision of the ruling revolutionary party if it is to perform its functions.

As the country progresses toward socialism, a new representative system of government bodies takes shape. This is one of the main tendencies in the development of the countries with a socialist orientation. The new system differs fundamentally both in form and in essence from similar systems in the bourgeois countries and the countries with a capitalist orientation. This is reflected both in the names of the representative bodies (in Algeria, Guinea, the Congo and in Madagascar the highest representative body is called the national people's assembly, and in Benin it is the revolutionary people's assembly) and in their essence: Their rejection of the principles of bourgeois parliamentarianism and the so-called division of authority; even during this stage, the countries with a socialist orientation adhere to the socialist principles of sovereignty of the people and unified authority.

The principle of sovereignty of the people stems directly from the constitutional articles discussing the public origins of power. "Supreme power," Art 2 of the 1979 constitution of the Congo says, "derives from the people." Article 26 of the 1976 Algerian constitution also declares that "the source of state power is the public will. The state serves only the people." All of the most important acts adopted in Benin, President M. Kerekou said in 1977, "promote the democratization of the revolutionary power referred to in the slogan we find most eloquent and most significant: 'Power to the people, all power to the people.'"⁷

The principle of unified power stems from the unified goals of the people and all organs of authority. There are no conflicts between the legislative and executive authorities--they are united in their desire to progress along their chosen path. Representative organs in the countries with a socialist orientation not only make decisions but also implement them. Therefore, all of these organs are working establishments. This makes cardinal changes in the interrelations between elective representative institutions and executive bodies. It considerably increases the regulating functions of parliaments, which oversee the activities of central and local executive directive bodies.

The work of the people's representatives in the parliament is regarded as one form of participation by the masses in state control in the countries with a socialist orientation. To ensure the necessary representation of the laboring public, an absolutely new democratic method of forming this representation has been adopted in order to secure the laboring public a specific number of seats. It is on this basis that the parliamentary elections in the Congo and Benin were held in 1979.

In the Congo the ratio of deputies to various political forces and social groups was established as the following: 153 deputies were elected in all, including 69 from the Congolese Labor Party, 36 from mass public organizations, 10 from the army, 20 from districts and communes in Brazzaville and 18 from workers employed at enterprises. In accordance with the statute on parliamentary elections in Benin, 336 commissioners (this is what members of parliament are called in this country) were elected, including 21 from the Benin People's Revolutionary Army, 84 from peasants and craftsmen, 33 from workers, 25 from school and lycee instructors, 12 from public health workers, 6 from the clergy, 33 from the army, 38 from mass organizations, 8 from the bourgeoisie and so forth. Although the elections in the Congo and in Benin were accompanied by a fierce political struggle, all of the candidates of progressive forces and the laboring public were elected.

The status of deputies in the countries with a socialist orientation differs fundamentally from the status of deputies in bourgeois countries and countries with a capitalist orientation. Here there is generally a so-called imperative mandate--that is, the power to recall deputies, which certainly heightens their responsibility to voters and establishes close and constant contact between deputies and voters.

The unified system in the countries with a socialist orientation consists of local representative bodies as well as parliaments. The local bodies are usually called people's or revolutionary councils or assemblies. In the majority of countries these bodies are of recent origin or are just now being created. Only in Guinea were local government bodies formed before the declaration of independence. In Algeria elections to local people's assemblies were held on the commune level in 1967 and on the wilaya level in 1969. In the Congo local people's councils were elected in 1973 (this is also when the institution of governor was abolished).

The Congo's experience in the formation of local organs of authority is indicative. The people's councils here grew out of the peasant councils which made their appearance in the country during preceding stages of the revolution. "After mapping out the structure of people's power," President D. Sassou-Nguesso of the Congo, chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labor Party, wrote, "we gave the masses a chance to form organizations, to participate in political and economic life and to discuss--on the local level--their own problems and settle them by themselves."⁸ The elections in 1973 were held without sufficient preparations, however, as a result of which the councils included many elements hostile to popular sovereignty. An analysis of the work of the elective organs 3 years after the elections indicated that their activity had positive and negative sides. The main negative feature was the fact that the elections were held before party structures had been created throughout the country. In the absence of party supervision, organs of people's power were infiltrated by provocateurs, opportunists and degenerates. The peasants often followed the lead of regionalists and tribalist elements and even elected overt reactionaries as long as these were people from their region or tribe. In connection with this, steps were taken to ensure party presence everywhere, and the party then began "serious work to correct the experiment in popular sovereignty."⁹

In Madagascar the formation of new local government bodies was a gradual process and was completed in 1979. The administrative reform of spring 1977 played a significant role in the process. The 1975 constitution (Art 1) assigns the role

of the "base socialist and democratic community," on which the state is founded, to the fokonolona, the lowest link of local government (or the fokontani, if we are referring to the territory on which the fokonolona is located). The fokonolona is one of the means of democratizing the regime and of expanding its social base. The formation of higher organs of local authority has passed through several stages: Members of fokontani executive committees have elected members of canton people's councils, etc. The Charter of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution of 1975 says the following about the high purpose of the fokonolonas: "Socialism within the fokonolona framework is the most effective and rapid way of attaining the goals of all-round, autonomous, fair and balanced development."

One of the most important and most difficult problems arising during the formation of the new government structure in the countries with a socialist orientation is the need to update the structure and fill it with personnel capable of dealing with new matters. Special schools (usually party schools) are opened for this purpose, where civil servants acquire the necessary political and ideological training. Some of the personnel of the lowest links of government also take party courses. Universities and some other higher and secondary specialized academic institutions have been opened for the more thorough training of personnel in the countries with a socialist orientation. Many specialists are studying in the USSR and other countries of the socialist community.

The renewal of the government service is accompanied by a so-called Africanization process--that is, the gradual substitution of African specialists for foreign employees. A similar process takes place in the countries with a capitalist orientation, but there the Africanization is essentially of no benefit to the broad laboring masses because bourgeois foreigners are generally replaced by bourgeois Africans. In the countries with a socialist orientation, on the other hand, laborers are often recruited to manage governmental and economic affairs.

In spite of all the work being conducted in the countries with a socialist orientation to create a new government structure and to train personnel for it, however, the process is an extremely difficult one and will apparently take a long time.

The development of the new type of state employees is being complicated by several negative features inherited by the countries with a socialist orientation from the recent colonial or neocolonial past, especially tribalism and corruption. Despite all of the significant changes that government bodies have undergone in the countries with a socialist orientation, forces striving to inhibit the construction of a new society and return the country to the capitalist road still have some influence within the government. The struggle for a genuine reorganization of the state structure is therefore of tremendous significance for the future of the socialist orientation in African countries. The negative features mentioned above are being overcome gradually, although this is not an easy task.

All of the multifaceted work involved in the creation of a new state structure in the countries with a socialist orientation is being conducted under the direct supervision of the ruling revolutionary parties. The ruling party of Guinea, said the secretary general of this party and the president of the country, A. Sekou Toure, is "an organ which makes and carries out decisions, a force controlling all legislative, executive and judicial organs in the country."¹⁰

Revolutionary parties also direct the activities of all public organizations. The 1976 Algerian constitution says, for example, that "mass public organizations, under the supervision and control of the party, will ensure the mobilization of the broadest segments of the population for the accomplishment of the great political, economic, social and cultural tasks on which the nation's development and success in the construction of socialism will depend" (Art 100). Public organizations, in turn, have a certain effect on the state structure and on the performance of its functions. They take an active part in the formation of representative bodies, in the management of economic and sociocultural construction, in the protection of the political and economic foundations of the state against reactionary intrigues and in the defense of the nation against outside aggression.

At the 26th CPSU Congress L. I. Brezhnev mentioned the importance of the "gradual reinforcement of the state structure with national personnel who are loyal to the people" to the countries with a socialist orientation.¹¹ This important and difficult task is being carried out by the leadership of the countries with a socialist orientation at the same time as the development and improvement of the state structure. State organizational work in these countries is aimed at the reinforcement of central and local organs of authority and is intended to channel the energy of the masses into the accomplishment of radical socioeconomic reforms, the elimination of existing difficulties and further progression toward socialism.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 33, p 172.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Pol. sob. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 33, p 39.
3. ETUMBA, 1973, No 295.
4. "Dans la voie de l'edification du socialisme," Cotonou, 1979, p 181.
5. "L'Annuaire de l'Afrique du Nord," Paris, 1966, pp 599-560.
6. "Dans la voie de l'edification du socialisme," p 120.
7. Ibid., p 257.
8. "Postup' svobodnoy Afriki" [The Move Made by Free Africa], Prague, 1978, p 123.
9. Ibid., p 124.
10. A. Sekou Toure, "Independent Guinea," Moscow, 1960, p 177.
11. "Materialy XXVI s'yezda KPSS" [Materials of the 26th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1981, p 12.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury, 1982

LIBYAN DOMESTIC, FOREIGN POLICIES UNDER QADHAFI EVALUATED

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 3, May-Jun 82 pp 23-31

[Article by L. B. Borisov]

[Text] The most important result of the fall of the monarchic regime in Libya on 1 September 1969 was the exclusion of the feudal-tribal aristocracy from the country's leadership and the transfer of power to representatives of the left wing of the petty bourgeois strata. The monarchy was overthrown by the army without the direct participation of the broad popular masses, but this act, which was in the common interests of the main social classes and groups (peasants, workers, intermediate strata and the national bourgeoisie), won widespread public support and was virtually bloodless.

The members of the underground Free Unionist Officers (FUO) who took power wanted above all to eradicate imperialism's political influence in the country and to win economic independence and a fitting place for Libya in the system of international relations. The supreme organ of state power became the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC), with Col Mu'ammarr Qadhafi as its chairman.

The country's new leaders gradually learned how dangerous it was to rely only on the army, particularly after they had to suppress antigovernmental conspiracies in December 1969, July 1970 and August 1975. They formed a broad political organization to mobilize mass support for the regime. The Arab Socialist Union (ASU), the creation of which was announced in June 1971,¹ was supposed to serve as this kind of organization. Its members included almost all of the adult inhabitants of the country, but it did not become the society's political vanguard. The activists and leaders of local ASU organizations generally did not display any initiative and were guided exclusively by orders from above. Later, the ASU was virtually dissolved when the governmental and political system was reorganized.

The new leaders took several steps to strengthen Libya's political independence and ensure its economic independence. Between 1971 and 1974 all foreign oil companies in Libya were completely or partially nationalized; 60 percent of oil production and all petroleum product distribution began to be controlled by the state. The country's oil revenues rose from 1.2 billion dollars in 1970 to 5 billion in 1975.² Steps were taken to put other foreign companies, especially banks, under state control. In July 1970 the property of 25,000 Italian colonists (37,000 hectares of land, real estate, stores and small workshops) was confiscated and distributed to Libyans.³

The government decided to establish Libya's own industrial base and assigned priority to the development of the state sector. It first adopted a 3-year plan for economic development, in accordance with which 5 billion dollars would be invested in industry and agriculture,⁴ and then a 5-year plan envisaging total investments of 26 billion dollars.⁵ The design and construction of several large enterprises began (a nuclear power plant, an oil refinery, a gas liquefaction plant with a capacity of 3.5 billion cubic meters, a metallurgical combine, etc.).

The restrictions imposed on the activities of foreign companies, the expulsion of non-Arab businessmen who had controlled much of the retail trade and service networks in Tripoli and Benghazi, and the expansion of the domestic market as a result of the rising standard of living created favorable conditions for the development of local capitalist enterprise. The bourgeois Libyans preferred to invest in trade and real estate, which promised a quicker return on capital, rather than in industry or agriculture. This led to the unbalanced development of the non-production sectors of the economy and also meant that considerable sums had escaped state control and could not be used for the economic development of the country.

Under these conditions, the Libyan leadership made a more intense effort to elaborate socioeconomic and ideological theories regarding the sociopolitical development of the country. The main goal was declared to be the construction of a "genuine socialist society" based on "the principles of Islam." The Libyan leaders were not prepared to accept the theory of scientific socialism as the basis of their concepts. Nevertheless, they objected to Libya's development according to the capitalist pattern, which, as M. Qadhafi stressed in his principal work, his "Green Book," represents a social order based on "robbery and theft, legitimized by the rules prevailing in this kind of society."⁶ This is how the Libyan "Third Theory" came into being. In Qadhafi's words, it was supposed to serve as "an alternative to capitalist materialism and communist atheism."⁷

Qadhafi maintains that "human history is propelled by the social, or national, factor, and the social connection between individual groups of people from the family to the tribe and the race constitutes the basis of historical progression."⁸ When he uses the term "social relations," he means relations between individuals united in a group, nationality and race. "Social relations" are regarded as "national" relations, and "national" are regarded as "social."⁹ According to the supporters of the "Third Theory," however, "social factors" lead to harmony and the "correct" development of society only when the "social factor" coincides with the religious one.¹⁰ Only Islam can guarantee that these two "factors" will "coincide" to the maximum and, consequently, that a society of social justice will be built (a "genuine socialist society," according to Libyan terminology).

In reference to the goal of socioeconomic development, Qadhafi proposes to create the kind of social order which will exclude the possibility of exploitation and in which "socialist" enterprises will work to satisfy the needs of society.¹¹ According to the Libyan leaders, this kind of society can be built only if the system of labor for wages is liquidated, if the means of production are "turned over directly to the laborers," who will become "partners in production," if private trade and the private ownership of real estate are abolished and if co-operative agriculture is organized.

The political theories of the Libyan leaders are based on the assumption that "the basic law of society is religion, which represents corroboration of the law of nature and the justification of customs,...a constant and sacred source" which stands "above time and all types of orders."¹² The idea of creating a "system of direct popular democracy" as a model political structure has been proposed. In this kind of system power would not be controlled by "representatives of a minority" but would be directly "exercised by the entire population."¹³

On the whole, it seems that the "Third Theory" can be regarded as one of the Islamic concepts of societal development whose dissemination is fairly typical of several of today's Asian and African countries.

Several important economic measures were taken in the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah (SPLAJ) in 1977-1981.¹⁴ There was considerable reinforcement of the state sector, which now accounts for over 70 percent of the commercial industrial product.¹⁵ The basis of the state sector is nationalized property; the Libyan Government either owns this property outright or controls at least 51 percent of it: oil companies, some branches of the processing and construction industries and banks. In accordance with the 3-year (1972/73-1974/75) and 5-year (1976-1980) plans for economic development, capital investments in industry totaled 1.7 billion Libyan dinars.¹⁶ Work is being conducted on several major projects for the creation of a metallurgical industry, tractor and motor vehicle manufacture, ship building and nuclear power engineering.

The Libyan leadership's attempts to implement the economic principles of the "Third Theory" led to the appearance of a locally managed sector in Libya along with the state and mixed sectors. On 1 September 1978 Secretary General Qadhafi of the General People's Congress (GPC) addressed a rally in Tripoli and advised laborers to "take over" enterprises and create local management committees (so-called "people's committees"). The only enterprises that were "taken over" however, were small and mostly privately owned factories, contracting and insurance companies, hotels and movie theaters. In 1978 the local management sector accounted for only 3 percent of the GNP.

Several measures were taken at the same time to undermine the positions of private capital in domestic trade. Goods are now sold to the population primarily through state stores and cooperative enterprises, whose shareholders are generally the workers and employees of various enterprises, departments or branches of industry. The decreasing number of merchants has sent more people into the production sphere. This is of considerable importance to Libya, which is suffering from an acute shortage of manpower and has had to resort to the widespread use of "imported" labor (the number of immigrant workers just from the Arab countries in the Libyan economy exceeds 300,000).¹⁷

On 6 May 1978, "Law No 4 on the Ownership of Real Estate" was passed. It stipulates that each family can own no more than one dwelling, and that rental property will be subject to expropriation and will be signed over to the tenants.¹⁸ In spite of all of the attempts of homeowners to circumvent this law, its provisions had been implemented in general by the end of 1980. This dealt a severe blow to the economic position of the most wealthy substratum of the Libyan bourgeoisie--the country's many homeowners. It was in this substratum that there was a

particularly rapid concentration of capital, which was then invested in the purchase of new real estate, in trade and sometimes even in the production sector. Therefore, the owners of real estate were the social group whose activity contributed most to the development of capitalism in Libya, and the subversion of this group's economic position was of considerable social significance.

In the sphere of agriculture the Libyan leadership decided to establish large mechanized state farms and cooperatives. By 1978 the cooperatives, which were essentially supply and sales centers, united 60,000 peasant farmsteads.¹⁹ On the other hand, the SPLAJ leaders' attempts to push a law through the General People's Congress on the expropriation of the privately owned fertile coastal lands encountered strong opposition and have been unproductive as yet.

The measures which have been taken, however, have produced positive economic results. The material and technical base of the national economy has been expanded considerably. In the 1970's the annual GNP growth rate sometimes reached 19 percent, the growth rate of industrial production reached 22 percent and the agricultural growth rate reached 29 percent.²⁰

Nevertheless, the intensive development of the country created a number of new problems: Disparities appeared in the national economy and more rural inhabitants moved to the cities, which aggravated the manpower shortage in a number of agricultural regions and had a negative effect on agricultural production. Besides this, the implementation of economic plans has been made difficult by the shortage of specialists and skilled workers, the limited supply of labor resources, the absence of the necessary experience, the flaws in the design of some enterprises, etc. The position of the rural bourgeoisie has grown stronger in recent years. In the second half of the 1970's the bureaucratic bourgeoisie acquired more influence. This is attested to indirectly by, in particular, the fact that the "Law on Economic Crimes," adopted by the GPC General Secretariat on 20 January 1978, included special articles envisaging harsh penalties for civil servants implicated in contracting and import operations, auctions and trade transactions, as well as civil servants who make use of commercial contract negotiations for selfish purposes.²¹

As for the economic principles of the "Third Theory," it turned out to be impossible to implement them in their entirety. For example, Libyan laborers are not receiving the "full product of labor" because workers and employees in the state and mixed sectors are still receiving wages and the surplus value they create is appropriated by the state. In the locally managed sector at least part of the surplus value created by the laborers of "people's enterprises" is also collected by the state in the form of taxes. State and cooperative stores sell goods at prices higher than purchase prices and make a profit. The abolished apartment rent has been replaced by compensation payments by tenants to the former owners. It must be said, however, that the Libyan leadership's socioeconomic reforms are undermining the bases of capitalist exploitation, and the surplus value acquired by the state is being used largely for the further development of productive forces, the elevation of the public standard of living and the resolution of social problems.

On the whole, the steps taken by the SPLAJ leadership in the socioeconomic sphere have created, in spite of their contradictory and inconsistent nature, some of the specific conditions required for the attainment of economic independence, the reinforcement and expansion of the state and locally managed sectors and the development of the cooperative movement.

In the sphere of domestic policy, the Libyan leadership has continued to implement the ideas of the "Third Theory." In March 1977 the Revolutionary Command Council was abolished. All of the power in the country was declared to belong to "local people's assemblies, regional people's conferences, people's committees and the General People's Congress (GPC)."²² A new system of political control took shape, with the distinctive feature that "local people's assemblies (LPA) are not elective organs but unite the entire adult population of the country on the basis of professional categories and places of employment and residence."²³ The activities of people's assemblies are overseen by elected supervisory committees. The supervisory committees of the LPA's in each region are united in a regional people's conference (RPC), which also elects a supervisory committee. The General People's Congress, which is convened annually, consists of the RPC supervisory committees, the leadership of regional people's committees (executive bodies) and the leaders of trade unions and public organizations.²⁴ The proposals of local government bodies are submitted to the GPC and are then executed by people's committees after they have been approved by the congress.

The positive aspect of this system is that it has contributed to the democratization of authority, has involved laborers in public administration to some degree and has familiarized the masses with political activity. However, the unification of the entire population, including representatives of antagonistic classes, in people's assemblies has turned the LPA's and RPC's into an arena of fierce political conflicts. The activity of people's assemblies is often of a formal nature. Besides this, as Qadhafi himself has admitted, government bodies are encountering the problems of red tape, bureaucracy and professional negligence.²⁵

The difficulties involved in the functioning of people's assemblies, people's committees and the GPC are largely due to the absence of a vanguard party in Libya. The creation of this kind of party would be inconsistent with the principles of the "Third Theory," which regards any party as "an instrument of dictatorial authority because it represents the domination of the whole by one of its parts."²⁶

Nevertheless, past political struggles have motivated the Libyan leadership to create some kind of vanguard political organization. This role has been assigned to the revolutionary committees that have been formed everywhere--at enterprises, in establishments and academic institutions, within people's assemblies and in populated points, cities and regions. Their main purpose, according to Qadhafi, is the generation of more energetic activity by people's assemblies and the involvement of LPA's in national management on a broad scale.²⁷ The revolutionary committees are responsible for the implementation of the SPLAJ leadership's major decisions in the political and economic spheres, the mobilization of the masses for a struggle to put these decisions in practice and the prevention of counter-revolutionary acts. Their members are only the individuals who have demonstrated

absolute loyalty to the current regime. The revolutionary committees supervise the "takeover" of enterprises and the institution of local management here. To a certain degree, the revolutionary committees aided in the eradication of private trade and the private ownership of real estate, the energization of the masses and the prevention of several counterrevolutionary demonstrations. It must be said, however, that the revolutionary committees do not represent a political party in the usual sense of the term and are merely an instrument for the implementation of the Libyan leadership's decisions. When Qadhafi spoke at the fourth rally of the revolutionary committee in March 1981, he warned against the transformation of these committees into "party cells" and said that they would be abolished if this should occur.²⁸

The Libyan leadership's foreign policy focuses on the Arab East, Africa and the Islamic world. Its strategic objectives in the Arab East are the achievement of Arab unity and the struggle to eradicate the after-effects of Israeli aggression. This policy is directed against, in M. Qadhafi's words, "imperialist forces hostile to the Arab race and ideals of freedom, forces which are striving to turn the Arab world into their own estate."²⁹ Special mention must be made of the role played by Libya in the mobilization of progressive Arab countries and organizations for a struggle against the Egyptian leadership's pro-imperialist policy of capitulation. It was at the initiative of Libya that a conference of the heads of state and government of progressive Arab countries and the PLO was convened in Tripoli after A. Sadat's Jerusalem trip of 2-5 December 1977. At this conference, a confrontation front was created, which represented, as L. I. Brezhnev stressed, "a front to counteract the policy of capitulation and the betrayal of Arab interests."³⁰ Libya took the most active part in the work of the second and third "summit" conferences of the countries making up the front, which were held in Algiers in February 1978 and in Damascus in September 1978, and in the fourth and fifth conferences in Tripoli in April 1980 and in Benghazi in September 1981. The Libyan leadership is promoting more vigorous action by the front and is working toward its cohesion and the more consistent implementation of its decisions.

In addition to this front, an all-Arab people's congress was created with the active assistance of the Libyan GPC in December 1978. This congress unites 72 political parties and 140 public organizations in the Arab countries. It serves patriotic forces in the Arab world as a forum and has become the sociopolitical base of the confrontation front.

The Libyan leadership attaches the greatest importance in its inter-Arab policy to the struggle for Arab unity and advocates the unification of the Arab countries on a progressive basis, favoring "the unification of the masses, and not unification for the purpose of suppressing the masses, not fascist unification or the kind of unification that perpetuates feudalism and capitalism."³¹ In recent years the Libyan Government has taken several steps to unite Libya with other Arab countries--Syria, Egypt (during President Gamal Abdul Nasser's lifetime and during the first years of Sadat's term in power), Sudan, Tunisia and Algeria. As a rule, however, these attempts were made without any consideration for the differences between Arab states or the current political situation, and this led to their failure.

The declared goal of Libyan policy in Africa is struggle for the total eradication of racism, colonialism and neocolonialism and for African and Arab-African unity. Libya is conducting a vigorous anti-imperialist policy on the African continent, is supporting the liberation movement of the people of southern Africa and is opposing intervention by imperialist powers, especially the United States, in African affairs. The Libyan leadership has consistently tried to consolidate bilateral relations with the African countries, particularly the progressive ones, as well as the Islamic states of this continent. It attaches great significance to the involvement of the African countries in the struggle to eradicate the after-effects of Israeli aggression and the struggle against the Camp David policy.

Libya's southern neighbor, Chad, occupies an important place in Libya's African policy. The Libyans support the Chad government of national unity, regarding it as the "legal government of Chad, formed in accordance with the Lagos agreement."³² According to the testimony of the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, Libyan military assistance played the deciding role in the suppression of a rebellion organized at the end of 1980 by an antigovernmental group called the "Armed Forces of the North" (FAN).³³ Libya's support of the legal Chadian Government aroused the displeasure of the United States and France, as well as Egypt and the Sudan, which had been giving assistance, including military aid, to the FAN for a long time and are still supporting antigovernmental forces in Chad.

Libya's plans for the Islamic world call for the liberation of the Muslim countries from pro-Western regimes, the triumph of "genuine," "revolutionary" Islam in these countries and the victory of "people's Muslim revolution." In this connection, the Libyan leadership feels it is important to support the Iranian revolution, which it views as the "cornerstone of a building erected by the popular masses" and with which it "associates the hope of the creation of a new Islamic state."³⁴ The Libyan leaders regard the events in Afghanistan as a struggle by revolutionary and progressive currents in Islam against reactionary and pro-imperialist currents and, in line with this, have supported the government of B. Karmal, have opposed intervention by Pakistan, Egypt, the United States and the PRC in the affairs of the DRA and have condemned the actions of Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

The Libyans draw a clear distinction between the imperialist and socialist systems, based on the premise that the imperialists, who, as Qadhafi stressed, "by virtue of their expansionist nature oppose freedom and peace," are their enemies, while the countries of the socialist system, with which Libya has "common goals, particularly in the struggle against imperialism, reaction, Zionism and capitalism," are their "natural allies."³⁵ It must be said, however, that the conflicts between SPLAJ and the imperialist states are of an objective nature, and the crux of the matter is not only that the Libyan leadership is pursuing a vigorous anti-imperialist policy (however important this factor may be in Tripoli's relations with the West), but also that this country is of considerable interest to imperialist monopolies. The profits on just the direct investments of multinational corporations in Libya totaled 3.5 billion dollars in 1972-1977.³⁶ The Libyan leadership's economic policy, however, is not only restricting the freedom of foreign companies but is also threatening their interests in SPLAJ in general.

The imperialist powers, especially the United States, regard Libya as one of their principal opponents in the region. The imperialists, backed up by local reactionaries, are employing the most diverse methods in their anti-Libyan policy: They are trying to accomplish the political isolation of SPLAJ, are threatening to use force against it, are organizing armed provocation, are supporting counterrevolutionary forces within the country, etc. In August 1981 the Pentagon organized provocative maneuvers close to the Libyan coastline, during the course of which American bombers attacked and shot down two Libyan Air Force planes. The CIA has plotted the assassination of Qadhafi. According to reports in the press, at the end of 1981 the United States was preparing for aggressive actions against Libya and was urging the Sudan to take part in them.³⁷ The United States is also trying to take advantage of Libya's economic ties with the world capitalist system. On 10 December 1981 President Reagan ordered American specialists working in Libya to leave this country. Soon afterward, apparently due to severe political pressure from Washington, the American Exxon Oil Company ceased operations in SPLAJ.

The objective basis of Libya's relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is the community of interests stemming from the liberating, anti-imperialist essence of the forces in power in SPLAJ, a community of liberation goals and the presence of a common enemy--imperialism. In the Soviet Union, L. I. Brezhnev said, the Libyans are regarded as "comrades-in-arms in the struggle for the rights and freedom of people, against imperialist oppression and aggression and for a lasting and just peace and social progress."³⁸

Libya's political relations with the socialist states are distinguished by a high level of development. This is attested to, in particular, by the intensive exchange of visits on the top level. Contacts are being established between the Libyan GPC and the communist parties of the socialist countries, and a Libyan delegation headed by GPC Deputy Secretary General Ali Bilkhayr attended the 26th CPSU Congress.

The USSR and Libya are in favor of the elimination of international tension, the reinforcement of peace and the defense of the legal interests and sovereign rights of people; they oppose the intrigues of imperialist forces in various parts of the world. During his talks with L. I. Brezhnev in 1981, M. Qadhafi made highly appreciative comments about the program set forth at the 26th Congress for the improvement of the world situation, the reinforcement of detente and the consolidation of public security.³⁹ He stressed that this program "will serve to counteract the imperialist policy of escalating tension and the arms race, issuing threats and interfering in the internal affairs of peoples."⁴⁰ In turn, the Soviet leaders commended the "Libyan people's efforts in the struggle to realize the common desires of the Arab people and in the fight against imperialism, colonialism, racism and Zionism."⁴¹

The USSR and other socialist countries are helping SPLAJ in the development of such leading branches of the economy as power engineering (including nuclear power), the oil and gas industry, agriculture and others. A distinctive feature of the socialist states' economic relations with Libya is that reciprocal deliveries and cooperation are carried out in accordance with long-range plans. A

joint commission set up in 1979 has played an important role in the development of Soviet-Libyan economic relations. "The current level of economic cooperation and exchange between the two countries will allow," a joint Soviet-Libyan communique of 1981 stresses, "for the further expansion of trade and economic ties."⁴²

A solid basis has been laid for the further development of Soviet-Libyan cooperation. "We," L. I. Brezhnev has stressed, "place an extremely high value on friendly relations with Libya and we are certain that they will continue to develop."⁴³

FOOTNOTES

1. "The Middle East and North Africa, 1975-76," London, 1976, p 530.
2. L'AFRIQUE AUJOURD'HUI, 1978, No 10.
3. "The Middle East and North Africa. 1975-76," p 529; "The Middle East and North Africa. 1976-77," London, 1977, p 530.
4. DEMAINE L'AFRIQUE, 24 March 1980.
5. THE AFRICAN BUSINESS, 1980, No 10.
6. Mu'ammār al-Qadhafi, "The Green Book. Section Two. The Revolution of the Economic Problem. 'Socialism'," Tripoli, 1977, p 29.
7. "The Middle East and North Africa. 1978-79," London, 1979, p 537.
8. Mu'ammār al-Qadhafi, "The Green Book. Section Three. The Social Aspect of the Third Theory," Tripoli, 1979, p 5.
9. Ibid., p 6.
10. Ibid., p 12.
11. Ibid., Sect 2, p 26.
12. P. Rossi, "La verte Libye de Qadhafi," Paris, 1979, pp 240-241.
13. Mu'ammār al-Qadhafi, "The Green Book. Section One. The Resolution of the Problem of Democracy. 'Popular Sovereignty'," Tripoli, 1976, p 11.
14. In march 1977 the country's name was changed from the "Libyan Arab Republic" to the "Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" (SPLAJ).
15. Ye. Tarabrin, "African Problems of the 1980's," MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', 1981, No 5, p 51.
16. S. A. Tovmasyan, "Liviya na puti nezavisimosti i sotsial'nogo progressa" [Libya on the Road to Independence and Social Progress], Moscow, 1980, 156-157.

17. AL-DUSTUR, 1980, p 12.
18. "Revolution d'al-Fateh en dix ans," Tripoli, 1979, p 78.
19. A. Zakharov, "Libya," in: "Mezhdunarodnyy yezhegodnik. Politika i ekonomika" [International Yearbook. Politics and Economics], Moscow, 1978, p 239.
20. AL-FAJR AL-JADID, 11 March 1977.
21. Ibid., 1 May 1979.
22. "Faits et chiffres. Al Jamahiriya Arabe Libyenne Populaire Socialiste. Departement de l'Information et des Affaires Culturelles," Tripoli, 1978, p 23.
23. P. Rossi, Op. cit., p 239.
24. Ibid.
25. AL-FAJR AL-JADID, 8 January 1978.
26. M. Qadhafi, Op. cit., Sec 1, p 12.
27. AL-FAJR AL-JADID, 4 March 1981.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 31 March 1981.
30. L. I. Brezhnev, "O vneshney politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva. Rechi i stat'i" [The Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State. Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1978, p 695.
31. AL-SAFIR, 21 January 1981.
32. AL-FAJR AL-JADID, 7 April 1980.
33. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, 20 April 1981.
34. AL-FAJR AL-JADID, 12 February 1980.
35. "Mu'ammarr Qadhafi's Visit to the Soviet Union. 27-29 April 1981," Moscow, 1981, pp 14-15.
36. G. Roshchin, "Africa in the Struggle for Economic Liberation," MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', 1981, No 2, p 117.
37. NOVOYE VREMYA, 1981, No 42, p 1.
38. "Mu'ammarr Qadhafi's Visit to the Soviet Union. 27-29 April 1981," p 10.

39. Ibid., p 23.

40. Ibid., p 11.

41. Ibid., p 34.

42. Ibid., p 30.

43. Ibid., p 13.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury,
1982

8588

CSO: 1807/131

END